THREE INQUIRIES

ON

THE FOLLOWING SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS:

I. THE PERSONALITY OF THE DEVIL.

II. THE DURATION OF THE PUNISHMENT EXPRESSED BY THE WORDS EVER, EVERLASTING, ETERNAL, &c.

III. DEMONIACAL POSSESSIONS.

BY

WALTER BALFOUR.

REVISED,

WITH ESSAYS AND NOTES,

BY OTIS A. SKINNER.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY A. TOMPKINS.
1854.

Stereotyped by
HOBART & ROBBINS,
New England Type and Stereotype Foundry
BOSTON.

PREFACE

TO THE REVISED EDITION.

In revising the following pages, I have been careful to make no change in any part, which would modify, in the least, the views expressed by the author. This work had the same characteristics in its style as the First Inquiry; and here, as in that, I have omitted some questions, statements and explanatory remarks, which the author, in his great desire to be distinctly understood, had very frequently repeated. I have also made some other changes, entirely of a verbal nature, though not of sufficient consequence to be noted.

It will be seen that I have added, besides the notes, between forty and fifty pages on topics intimately connected with the subjects discussed in the work. In what I have written I have availed myself of the latest researches on the points discussed; and I feel that in that respect, at least, the matter added is of value.

I need say nothing in commendation of this work; for it has had a wide circulation, and is known to be distinguished alike for its candor, its just criticisms, and its patient investigations. Mr. Balfour prized truth more than money, position or popularity; and, therefore, he honestly sought for truth, and as honestly declared it to the world.

From his preface I give the following: — "I make no apology for availing myself of quotations from various authors in the course of my remarks, for they are chiefly taken from writers whose religious creeds embraced the opinions controverted. None of them are taken from professed Universalists, for by most people their testimony would be deemed exceptionable, however well supported by evidence. The testimonies

quoted in favor of my opinions are from men competent to judge, and in high repute as critics and commentators among orthodox people. They are quoted, not to give sanction to my views by the weight and number of their names, but on account of the evidence which they produce.

"In the present work, the strongest texts in favor of endless punishment are considered, and attention given them in proportion to the degree of stress laid on them in favor of this doctrine. In some instances, we have referred to our former Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, and Gehenna, for an illustration, which the reader will please consult. And in all cases, we hope the texts referred to will be examined by the reader, as they confirm or illustrate the views advocated.

"The author is deeply sensible that the views advanced are very unpopular, and will be condemned by many without a hearing. He is sorry for such persons on their own account; for this cannot stop the advance of light and knowledge in the present day, any more than sleeping all day can stop the sun in his course. If what I have advanced be true, it must prevail against all opposition; for great is the truth, and must prevail. If my sentiments are false, the sooner they are refuted and forgotten, the better. If this can be done, it no doubt will be done, and to the doing of it we shall add our hearty amen."

CONTENTS.

PART I.

PART II.

PART III.

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY ON TEMPTATION.

The Bible is remarkable for the truthful views it gives of temptation. Its inspired authors had a perfect knowledge of human nature, and of the manner in which sin gains dominion. Though their representations of its origin and progress are various, they accord exactly with all we know of ourselves, and of the influences to which we are subjected. The allegories they employ are wonderful pictures of man, as he stands connected with the seductions of evil; and in them we have the nicest delineation of all there is, within and around us, to lead astray. In their mere historical representations there is the same clear insight of our nature, and the same correct view of internal and external influences. In the passages giving an analysis of our physical and moral being, without figure or allegory, we see the same thorough knowledge. To whatever portion of the Bible we turn, we find one doctrine respecting temptation, according with all we know of our nature, from psychology, reason and experience. Everywhere man is recognized as a being endowed with appetites and passions, and as having united with these a moral nature, capable of seeing the difference between right and wrong, good and evil, causing a feeling of condemnation and shame when he sins, and of worthiness and self-approval when he is obedient.

The appetites and passions are the springs of action. Everything we do can be traced to them. We hunger and thirst, and therefore eat and drink. We love society, amusement, honor and power, and therefore exert our energies to gain what we desire. When the appetites and passions are regulated by law they are innocent sources of enjoyment; when not thus regulated they are sinful sources of enjoyment. Sin consists not in their gratifi-

cation, but in their improper gratification. Sin is over-indulgence, and indulgence at the expense of truth, justice, kindness and mercy. Virtue is the right regulation of our appetites and passions, and the use of them for the high ends of existence.

According to this view of man, it is easy to see why he sins. The appetites, finding pleasure in indulgence, lead to excess; they may become so inordinate in their demands, as to induce one to steal, to defraud, to lie, in order to obtain what they desire. The drunkard is an illustration of this. By the use of intoxicating drinks, he so perverts a natural appetite that he has a burning thirst, which makes him deaf to reason and recreant to every moral requisition. What is true of the appetites is equally true of the passions. The miser's love of money is so strong, that he is false to all moral and religious obligations, a being of meanness, deception and injustice. All our passions are capable of the same perversion. Emulation may grow into envy, just resentment into revenge, and a desire to exert a good influence into an unbounded ambition.

Every man feels constantly the pressure of temptation to transgress. The luxuries of the table invite to excess. The desire for gain, honor and place, leads us to omit moral and religious duties, to give ourselves to what seems to have the highest present value, to trespass upon the rights of others, and accomplish our purpose by unholy means. This pressure of temptation, this unceasing appeal of the world, shows why all men sin, and begin their evil career so early in life. It shows, too, why men, without any instructor or guide, fall into vicious habits, and why men in all ages have had the same characteristics.

A reference to the Scriptures will fully establish the correctness of this theory. In order to obtain the whole weight of their authority, we must consider the three forms in which they present the subject.

I. *The allegorical.* Many regard the Mosaic account of the first temptation as extremely perplexing, giving but little, if any, certain information upon the subject. Their whole difficulty arises from the supposition that his account is a literal history, whereas it is an allegory. Here we have language attributed to the serpent, and a detailed account of his interview with Eve, and

the cunning employed in tempting her. To suppose that a literal serpent was intended, that God endowed it with speech, or that the devil used it as his agent and spoke through it, are absurdities too great for refutation. Call the account an allegory; say that Moses uses the serpent as a representation of the appetites and passions, and you make it worthy an inspired teacher, and in accordance with a favorite method of giving instruction in ancient times. The whole at once becomes natural,—the garden representing the primitive condition of our first parents, its fruits the good and evil of life, and expulsion from it the shame, remorse and other consequences which resulted from transgression. We need no talking serpent, with reason, to account for all that the woman did. The particulars of her temptation and sin show this.

First, Eve saw that the forbidden tree was good for food, and her appetite craved it. In this respect, her temptation was like that which now assails persons. A large proportion of our sin has the same origin. Second, The tree was pleasant to the eye. Here is another source of sin. The eye is constantly tempting us. We are fond of show and parade; we love the tinsel of fashion and wealth; and, to gratify the eye, we neglect the highest duties of life, and even cheat and oppress. How many, in order to secure the adornments of the world, prove recreant to God, religion and all moral obligations! Third. The tree was calculated to make one wise. Here was an appeal to pride and ambition. to the love of consequence and distinction, a passion which often exercises a mighty sway for evil. It makes men press forward in the race for wealth and distinction with an all-controlling determination; causes them to trample upon their fellow-men with unfeeling disdain, and make them stepping-stones to reach the towering eminence upon which they fix their gaze. It has fired the souls of the Alexanders and the Cæsars of the world, and rendered men so eager for wealth that they could find music in nothing but the ring of the dollar. Whoever will carefully analyze his own experience, will find in these three particulars the sources of his sins.

But we have not yet done with this allegory. It contains other facts, showing how Eve was tempted. Of all the trees of the gar-

den, save one, our first parents had permission to eat. The number of them was not small. It contained every tree that was pleasant to the sight and good for food, and in the midst of it stood the tree of life. The provision was bountiful, and yet Eve seemed to forget it all, and think only of the prohibition. She was dissatisfied, and felt that God had not been as kind as he might. In the case of every sinner the same scene is reënacted; one evil makes us blind to all the mercies we possess. Eve's dissatisfaction led her to misrepresent the prohibition, and present it in an odious light, and give God an arbitrary character (chap. 3 : 3). She exaggerated, just as a child does in regard to a law it dislikes, and as all people do in speaking of laws which prohibit what they desire. But she did not stop here. She changed the language of God; she left out the word "*freely*," as though anxious to cast all possible reflection upon his character; she changed the language of the penalty, so that, instead of being certain, it was doubtful. While God had said, "Ye shall surely die," Eve altered the penalty, and made it read, *Lest ye die!* And when she had made this change, she found no difficulty in believing that death was uncertain. Here is the grand mistake of all sinners,— the main deception in all temptation. "The consequence is not certain, the event feared may not come," sinners say; and in proportion as they doubt here, do they feel assured of safety in evil.

In these considerations, we see clearly that Eve was tempted by the appeal made to her appetites and passions, and that, as these gained power, she changed in mind and feeling towards God and his law.

We have another allegory in which the process of temptation is the same. I refer to the account of the Saviour's temptation in the wilderness. Here we have a narrative detailing all the steps taken by the devil in the temptation; but the narrative of an allegory is not to be regarded as true any more than of a fable or parable. It is used merely as a representation of truth, and to give the account spirit and force. The sayings ascribed to the tempter are the thoughts and feelings of the Saviour himself, in which he sets forth the misuse he might make of his own special gifts. Keeping in mind that the narrative is a mere fiction, as in

David's allegory, where he (Psalm 80) represents the people of Israel under the image of a vine, let us consider this temptation.

First, we have an appeal to the appetite. Jesus had been fasting forty days; and the inquiry arose, why he should suffer thus, when he had power to convert stones into bread. A moment's reflection banished the temptation, for his power was given not for his own good, but that of the world. The second temptation was an appeal to the eye. Cast yourself down from the pinnacle of the temple; do something bold and grand, to excite the applause of the multitude; you shall be safe, "for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." But a miracle so ostentatious and useless would be tempting God,—an abuse of the power given him, the object of which was not to secure applause and excite wonder, but to build up a kingdom of holiness and truth. The third temptation was an appeal to ambition,—the love of dominion. He is offered all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them, if he will only make his power subservient to the worldly principle. No sooner is the temptation presented than it is rejected with disdain.

Thus Jesus was tempted in all points as we are. He had in three forms temptations to misemploy his special gifts; but he yielded not to the allurements. Viewing the account in this light, the temptations are all natural; and, while we admit that they were actual occurrences, we avoid the absurdity of supposing that Christ had a personal interview with a fallen angel, who quoted Scripture to him, took him from the wilderness and put him on the holy temple, upon a tower which rose seven hundred and fifty feet above the valley at its base, and thence took him to an exceeding high mountain, where he showed him and offered him all the kingdoms of the world. As a fictitious narrative for a representation of evil, this has great naturalness, and is in keeping with oriental allegories, but as a literal history it is in itself absurd and impossible.

II. It is time to pass from these allegorical representations of temptation, to the accounts given in history. It is not necessary

to present many instances, or dwell at length on those presented. There is no point on which history is more plain than on this.

I will begin with Noah. Though a man of great piety, and a preacher of righteousness, he was not without his weaknesses. We are told after the flood he became a husbandman (Gen. 9 : 20, 21, 22), and planted a vineyard; and he drank of the wine and was drunken. Indulgence corrupted his appetite, and excess was the consequence. Here is the way that drunkenness generally originates. The temptation is in the cup which affords pleasure to the taste. One of the sins of Sodom was fulness of bread. Gluttony gained its power there as with us, and in all places. The temptation is in the richly-spread table. Thousands are yearly ruined by their appetite.

Nebuchadnezzar is a striking instance of the corrupting influence of the pride of the eye, or the desire for show, and pomp, and splendor, in houses, equipage and dress. Never was a king more perfectly captivated by the grandeur and attractions of the world. The city over which he ruled was one of unequalled beauty and glory. Its towers, temples and palaces stood before him as monuments of the skill, and taste, and wealth, at his command; and its hanging gardens, on which vast treasures were expended, were the wonder and admiration of a world. Such a city existed not upon the earth; it was the proudest work on which the eye could gaze; and as he surveyed it, with exulting pride and boasting vanity, he exclaimed, "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built, for the house of my kingdom, by the might of my power, and for the honor of my name?" The haughty ruler was completely captivated, and his whole heart was in slavery to the magnificence and splendor of his city. He had no sense of dependence or of obligation, and acknowledged no being in the universe to be his superior. How many are thus ruined by their passion for show, their love of decoration! Fashion, ornament, and the trappings of wealth are tempters which make thousands false to all that is good.

Hazael is an instance of the corrupting power of dominion, station and wealth. He lived in the time of Elisha; and when that faithful man discerned by his prophetic eye the tyranny and cruelty of which the destined king would be guilty, the good man

burst into tears. Hazael asked the cause of his strong emotions; and when informed, and the picture of his future character was held up to him, his soul abhorred it, and he indignantly spurned the idea that he could ever become thus barbarous and bloody. Contemptuously did he ask, "What! is thy servant a dog that he should do this great thing?" Elisha's answer was simply this, "The Lord hath showed me that thou shalt be king over Syria." Time witnessed the fulfilment of this prediction; ambition took possession of the king's soul, and he smote the children of Israel in all their coasts, oppressed them during all the days of Jehoahaz, and proved himself a man of violence and cruelty. He was ruined by his love of power and dominion. This made his heart like stone, and caused him to hew down, with a ruthless hand, all who fell under his displeasure.

In these items of history we see how men are tempted. They listen to their appetites and passions, rather than reason and the voice of God; they prefer the pleasure which transgression offers, to the rewards of obedience.

III. We have, if possible, a clearer presentation of the doctrine advocated, in those passages where the inspired writers give an analysis of our nature. St. John has the most lucid statement which could be made, showing the three forms in which temptation assails us. He says, "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but of the world" (1 John 2: 16). The lust of the flesh denotes those fleshly appetites which find pleasure in sensual indulgences. The lust of the eyes means an inordinate passion for magnificence in houses, furniture, equipage and dress. The pride of life means that grasping spirit which finds its highest gratification in titles, offices and dominion.* Of the same import are such passages as the following: "But every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lusts and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death" (Jas. 1: 14). "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts, that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not; ye kill and desire to have, and cannot obtain; ye fight and war,

* See Macknight in loc.

yet ye have not, because ye ask not" (James 4: 1, 2). Here we have an explicit statement of man's nature, and of the way in which he is led into sin. Drawn away and enticed,—caught with a bait. The appetites and passions desire unlawful indulgence, and that desire leads to transgression. Paul gives the same idea when he says, "They that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition" (1 Tim. 6: 9). Those having a strong desire for great wealth are peculiarly subject to temptation, for that desire leads them to the adoption of sinful measures, to be fraudulent, dishonest, oppressive. But this is not all. The desire extinguishes all benevolent and generous feelings, and makes man selfish, and places him completely under the dominion of the lowest and meanest passions. In further illustrating this point, the apostle adds, "For the love of money is the root of all evil; which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced their souls through with many sorrows" (1 Tim. 6: 10). That is the root of all the evils enumerated. The love of it caused vast numbers to turn from Christ, to depart from the faith; for they were unwilling to give up all for religion.

According to the analysis given of man in the foregoing passages, we see that in consequence of our appetites and passions we have desires, and that our desires are excited by whatever will minister, or it is supposed will minister, to our enjoyment. The appetite of the drunkard makes him desire intoxicating drinks, and had he no appetite, they could not tempt him. The love of power makes man desire station, authority, dominion; and did he not possess this passion, power could not tempt him. Hence the Saviour, using the word heart to denote the seat of the passions and understanding, says, "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies" (Matt. 15: 19). The idea of Solomon is the same,—"Frowardness is in his heart; he deviseth mischief continually" (6: 14). Jeremiah says, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, who can know it?" (17: 9). Paul says, "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh" (Gal. 5: 17); and that the

"works of the flesh are adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings" (5 : 19, 20, 21). "For we ourselves, also, were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful and hating one another" (Titus 3 : 3).

If we examine the works of those who have written upon the appetites and passions, we shall find them fully confirming the foregoing views. In their analysis of man as a moral being, they all trace his desires to his appetites and passions. They show that these are subject to the control of two classes of influences: one embracing all there is that can produce unholy desire and action; and the other, all there is that can produce holy desire and action. They refer drunkenness, gluttony, and all kindred evils, to the animal propensities; they refer the frauds and injustice employed in procuring wealth to avarice, and the reckless conduct of those struggling for dominion to ambition. All agree in the idea that there must be something within which is to be gratified by an object, or it can neither be sought nor desired. It is not pretended that man seeks all he desires. Sometimes he is deterred from seeking by the amount of labor which it would cost; sometimes by the injury it would be to his reputation; sometimes by his regard for principle. When wrong is done, the ruling desire is superior to the sway of reason, conscience and religion; and when duty is done, reason, conscience, religion, control the animal propensities and the passions.

Taking this theory as their basis, the writers to whom I refer urge the importance of heeding strictly every law given for our guidance; for if appetite gains the mastery, or if one passion is perverted, man may become as reckless and unreasonable as one who is insane. On the other hand, the more faithfully the divine law is regarded, the more complete will be the ascendency of the spiritual nature, and the more perfect the pleasure enjoyed from benevolence, justice, mercy and kindness. Our safety is in keeping the curb upon whatever, if unrestrained, would lead us astray, and in doing all in our power to develop our moral nature.

This theory of man is universally acknowledged. Our govern-

ment assumes its truth; every person having the control of children assumes its truth; so does every reformer. The statesman, the teacher, the parent, the temperance advocate and the peace advocate all assume it; and to deny it is to contradict universal experience. And yet some theologians, and in opposition to all their other views, deny it, and say that sin originates not with man, but with a being called the Devil, Satan, &c.; that he gives us our evil thoughts and desires; that he is the first mover in every sin. The celebrated Dr. South has given a very minute account of the agency of this arch foe. Among the wonders he can accomplish are the following: 1. Moving, stirring and altering the humors and disposition of the body, producing disease, and using it as a means of causing sin. 2. Suggesting ideas and spiritual pictures to the imagination. 3. Entering into, and taking personal possession of man, so as to move and act him. Dr. South asserts all this, with as much confidence as anything he advances in his discourses, and calls the Devil an expert anatomist, who has examined and looked into all the secret recesses, and caverns, and little fibres, both of body and soul; a skilful artist, who can make a picture for the imagination as well as for the eye. Dr. F. D. Maurice, in his Theological Essays, endorses this idea. In Essay No. 3, on the Evil Spirit, though he admits that climate has an effect upon the body, and in that way upon the thoughts and habits,— that manners, customs, laws and education have a great influence on character,— he contends that without the agency of a spirit speaking to our spirit, and stirring up the inclination, we should not have temptation! In a besotted appetite and a perverted passion he can see no power to produce it. They are only instruments in the hands of the Evil Spirit!

Neander, in his Life of Christ, takes the same view. He argues that Christ's temptation was not an inward one, but the work of Satan; for, he says, it was not possible that Christ should have compared the evil with the good and decided between them; that his steadfast adherence to God was such, his submission so rooted, as to admit of no struggle. But how, unless there was a struggle, was there a temptation? Christ was tempted. This means more than that an evil spirit made propositions which had not the slightest influence upon him; for in that case he was not

tempted. We must feel the pressure of the enticement, or we are not enticed. If I am solicited to do what is wholly repugnant to my nature, and which I can feel no desire to do, it is not a temptation.

The history in the case justifies this reasoning. Jesus had supernatural power, and could have changed stones to bread, and appeased his hunger; but this would have been using his gifts for his own benefit, whereas it was necessary that he should be one with the poor and suffering, and follow God in self-denial, trusting in his mighty power to help him in the way he might see fit. Through his whole ministry Jesus acted upon this principle. When others hungered he fed them; but he never supplied his own wants, or served himself, by an exertion of his power. When apprehended by the Jewish officers, when on trial before the Jews and the Romans, and when hanging upon the cross, he adhered to this principle, though he could have called legions of angels to his aid. Hence, when one of his disciples drew a sword and cut off an ear of the high priest's servant, Jesus ordered the sword to be put up, and said that he could call down twelve legions of angels (Matt. 26 : 53), but this he chose not to do, for it was necessary that he should give himself entirely into the hands of his foes. Here we see how much was included in the first temptation; Jesus saw what he was to suffer; the keen hunger which he felt was a foretaste of all the woe that awaited him, and the suggestion which came through his appetite was to so use his power as to avoid it all.

In the second temptation there was an additional enticement. Two methods of procedure were before Christ. One was slow, and would require him to encounter the hostility, and bitterness, and error, of the Jewish nation; the other was quick, and required him to conform so far to the popular expectation as to secure the friendship of the Jews. They asked for miracles of show and parade, for striking displays of power, signs from heaven; and could they have seen these, they would have hailed the Saviour as their Messiah. What an appeal here to the lust of the eye! Sitting in mind on the lofty temple in the metropolis of Judea, he had a view of its grandeur and beauty, and of the multitudes which he could instantly call to his support. But, to obtain their

friendship, he must so far depart from the legitimate use of his power, as to perform not miracles of mercy, but of show and ostentation. He therefore rejected the offer, knowing fully all it would cost, and what a ministry of ignominy, and hardship, and peril, would be his. While he would not tempt God, expose himself to unnecessary danger, he would trust him for support, in whatever path duty required him to walk.

In the third temptation the promise was enlarged. While the first promise was, that he should be raised from a state of weakness and dependence, and the second, that he should have at once a rich kingdom and a numerous support, the third was, that he should have command over all the kingdoms of the world. What a dazzling picture! How captivating to the eye of ambition! How different this glittering prize from persecution, reproach and the cross! "The world with its crowns and sceptres passed before his mind. Mighty cities with all their magnificence stood present to his eye. Earth and her inhabitants, her riches, and honors, and pleasures, lay at his feet!" But, in order thus to gratify ambition, he must so far use the worldly element as to make his kingdom an outward one, or at least to lay its first foundations without, give it a secular character, a worldly form. This he could not do, for a kingdom thus established could not give freedom and peace to the world.

When the temptations of the Saviour are taken into consideration, we see that Dr. Neander is wrong in supposing that Christ felt no pressure from them in the higher powers of his soul. He surveyed each of them, as they were presented to his mind; and though they did not make him yield, he so far entertained them as to contrast what they offered with what duty would bring. In direct opposition to Neander, therefore, we must say that we suppose in him a choice, which, presupposing within him a point of tangency for evil, would involve the necessity of his comparing the evil with the good, and deciding between them. Unless this was so, there is no propriety in Paul's language, when he says, "Jesus was in all points tempted, like as we are, yet without sin" (Heb. 4 : 15). And we have seen that he was thus tempted. Appetite tempted him; the lust of the eye tempted him, and so

did the desire for dominion, which Milton calls the "last infirmity of noble minds."

Neander's idea, therefore, that Christ's temptation was from without, and not from within, is radically wrong; it denies that in reality Christ was tempted, or was capable of temptation. If we feel in temptation the pressure of the enticement, Christ must have felt it. Equally erroneous is the idea of Dr. Maurice, who supposes that all temptation comes from the Devil. No evil spirit is necessary in order to make a passionate man return wrong for wrong, or a thief steal when an opportunity is presented, or an inebriate drink too much when the full cup sparkles before him. Appetite makes us desire food, and an inordinate appetite makes us desire an excess of food.

That, in man and surrounding influences, we are to look for temptation, will be clear, if we consider with care the apostle's description of its several steps. "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin, and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death" (James 1: 14, 15). Here are no less than five gradations by which temptation triumphs. The first draws man away from his proper employment, seduces him to turn aside, and consider what is proposed for his enjoyment. The second is an allurement, or, as James calls it, *enticement*, and consists in pleasing the imagination. The third controls the will, and consists in the formation of a purpose to yield. The fourth is the commission of the act. And the fifth is the formation of a fixed habit, giving sin a complete dominion. In these several steps we see no occasion for any agency except that of which the apostle speaks,— the agency of the lusts. And this by no means is a small agency. Let us notice their influence.

1st. When a man desires an object, he has created within him a dislike of its opposite. If he desires pleasure, he dislikes toil; if he desires indulgence, he dislikes the rigid rules of abstinence. He cannot like two things exactly opposite. And, therefore, when we see a person uneasy, dissatisfied with work, ready to omit his duty, we may be certain that some evil influence has got possession of him, that lust has given him a false vision, judgment

and taste. When a man dislikes his country, home or business, he is very ready to leave it, and throw off all its obligations.

2d. Lust has a peculiar power to present, in the most attractive light that is possible, the object desired. It hides all the evils it will produce, and clothes in the richest garb all its advantages. If there is a sweet in it, that is presented and held up for enjoyment. Man never, when under the dominion of lust, sees with an impartial eye; he is blind to the evil, and beholds through a magnifying glass the good. The covetousness of Judas saw only the worth of the money to be given for his treachery; the baseness of his ingratitude and perfidy was not seen, and everything like duty, right and fidelity, was shut out of his mind. One passion controlled him, and that was covetousness; one object filled his mind, and that was the money he was to receive. He thought not of the guilt which would stain his soul, and of the vileness of the part he was to act. It is always so when evil desire controls us; only the advantage to be gained is seen. Joseph was tempted; yet the temptation was not superior to his sense of duty, to the voice of conscience, and he fell not. Moses was tempted; but all the pleasures and honors of the court of Egypt were deemed a trifle compared with the satisfaction of giving deliverance to the oppressed Hebrews. We yield only when the deception, the illusion, blinds the mind, and makes it consent. Hence the injunction, "When sinners entice thee consent thou not." The promises of sin are false, its representations are deceptive. Eve was beguiled, and therefore fell.

Thus we need not suppose the existence of an evil spirit, in order to account for all the sin of which man is guilty. There are causes in the appetites and passions for every transgression; and he who would be wise should make himself fully acquainted with them. Those who agree with the doctrine of this Essay, who are convinced that sin originates without the agency of an evil spirit, are prepared to enter with profit upon a perusal of the first part of the following work, in which it is clearly shown that the Bible gives no proof whatever of the existence of such a being. We commend what is there said to the candid attention of the reader.

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE DEVIL AND SATAN.

SECTION I.

COMMON OPINIONS ENTERTAINED OF THE DEVIL AND SATAN BRIEFLY STATED.

THE opinions entertained, concerning a being called the Devil and Satan, are many. We shall give a brief summary of them under the following particulars:

1st. *The unity of the Devil.* It is the common opinion that there is but one being properly called the Devil. It is not more certainly believed that God is one, than that the Devil or Satan is one. Though God is said by many to be three persons in one being, yet the Devil has never been supposed to be more than one person in one being. Dr. Campbell, Dissert. 6, says, "Nor can anything be clearer from Scripture than that, though the demons are innumerable, there is but one Devil in the universe."

2d. *The origin of the Devil.* The common opinions about this are: —that he was, originally, one of the angels of God in heaven. God did not create him a devil, but he became so by his own sin and rebellion. It is also believed that he drew a multitude of the heavenly hosts into rebellion with him, who have shared his fate, are called his angels, and that he has become

their chief. His sin is supposed to have been pride; but how, or about what it arose, we have never seen properly explained. The time is not ascertained when all this took place; but it must have been before Adam and Eve sinned, as he is said to have been their seducer. Supposing all this to be true, we can answer the long agitated question—"Whence cometh evil?" It came from heaven. It originated among the holy angels of God. But how it could originate in heaven, and among such holy beings, I must leave for others to explain. Admitting such opinions true, I ask, if sin once originated there and among such beings, why may it not again, yea, often; and why not extend to all the ransomed of the Lord? Why may they not all finally become devils, by sin and rebellion against the Lord? What is the security given that nothing of a like nature shall ever take place again in heaven?

3d. *His expulsion from heaven and his place of abode since.* How long the Devil maintained his place in heaven after he sinned, we have never seen stated. All agree, that he was cast out of heaven; but where he was cast to, and where his abode has been since, men are not agreed. Some say he was cast down to hell, and has been there in chains of darkness ever since. Others allege that his abode is in the air, or our atmosphere. The most general opinion is, that he walks about in our world like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, and will continue to do so until the consummation of all things. Some have thought that he has his residence in the heart of every wicked man, and is the cause of all the evil devised. These opinions cannot all be true, which creates a suspicion that they may all be false.

4th. *The nature and character of the Devil.* The Devil is universally believed to be a spirit. God is not more certainly believed to be a good spirit, than he is believed to be an evil spirit. Not one good quality is supposed to be in his nature or character. On the contrary, every evil, and that in the highest degree, is found

in him. He is a perfect compound of all that is evil, and the irreconcilable enemy of God and man. As he is incapable of being made better, it is believed he is so bad that he cannot be made worse. To say a person is as bad as the Devil, is saying the worst that can be said of him.

5th. *The extraordinary powers ascribed to him.* Many people consider him almost omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent. He is supposed to know the thoughts, words and actions, of all men; to be in all parts of the world at the same time; and to have a power little inferior to God himself. God is the only being in the universe who is able to control him. He can assume any form, shape, or color; and, though an angel of darkness, can transform himself into an angel of light. One would be almost led to think he had greatly increased his powers by his sin and rebellion; for no good angel is ever represented as possessing such extraordinary powers as Christians ascribe to the Devil. If his powers have been curtailed by his rebellion against God, what must they have been before it?

6th. *How the Devil is employed.* It would be an endless task to enumerate all the various work in which he is supposed to have engaged since his expulsion from heaven. One of his first devices was to tempt our first parents to sin, and thereby ruin them and all their posterity. Ever since, he has been seducing every son and daughter of Adam to all kinds of sin, fomenting all sorts of mischief, and producing misery in our world. He is supposed to be walking about, seeking whom he may devour. deceiving the whole world, and accusing the very best of men before God. He infuses evil thoughts and desires into men's minds, and is ever ready to assist them in the execution of their wicked purposes, and the gratification of their sinful lusts and passions. He is supposed not only to inflict many severe bodily diseases, but to harass the mind, so as to drive persons to distraction and suicide. He is believed to have been the cause of all Job's afflic-

tions; to have bound a woman eighteen years with an infirmity; and urged Judas on in his course of wickedness until he betrayed Jesus, and was finally led to hang himself. He is also allowed to blind men's minds about the gospel, harden their hearts, and work in the heart of every child of disobedience. He not only picks up the seed of the word when sown, lest men should believe it and be saved, but makes those who believe it the objects of his particular malice, whom, though he cannot ruin forever, he is determined to render as miserable as possible. All wicked men are his, and his care is to keep them under his power and dominion. Some marvellous accounts have been given of his torturing and tormenting good people, and of some who sold themselves, soul and body, to him. At the stipulated time, he has come and carried them away bodily to hell. It is the belief of some, that, at death, the Devil carries off the souls of wicked men to the same place. Those who wish to inform themselves more fully on this subject, may consult Boston's Works, Edwards, Jeremy Taylor, Godwin, and many other authors.

7th. *The various names by which he is designated.* What the Devil's name was before he sinned in heaven we have never been able to ascertain; but, since then, there is no want of names, which are supposed to distinguish him from every other being. He is called in Scripture, as many suppose, satan, devil, evil one, tempter, old serpent, god of this world, prince of this world, and prince of the power of the air. These are his principal titles, with a few others which are of less consequence, and do not require any particular notice. He has also a great variety of vulgar names, which to put on paper would only be to promote the laughter of fools, which is no object with me in writing. If such a being does exist, we are called to weep, rather than to laugh. If he does not, I wish soberly and seriously to expose such a false and pernicious opinion. We protest against the common use of such names in daily conversation,

whether the people believe or disbelieve his existence. One thing we remark, that all such vulgar names are intended to designate a real being or fallen angel, by people who thus use them.

8th. *His endless existence and future prospects.* It is not only believed the Devil does exist, but that he will forever exist, the same wicked and malignant being. It is the common opinion, that no Saviour has been, or ever will be, provided for him. He is considered beyond the limits of God's mercy. This door is forever closed to him, and his repentance and return to his former allegiance and happiness is considered utterly hopeless. Nor is it thought that he will ever desire it, but would scorn such a proposal; for his mind is made up, rather to reign in hell than serve in heaven. Some have held that he will finally be restored, but will be the last being in the universe who will be delivered from future misery.

But it is the general opinion, that, however miserable the Devil is, he has nothing better to hope for; nor is he concerned for his miserable condition. As God cannot, or will not, alter it, so he disdains to complain, or to sue for mercy. With such an endless, dreary prospect of intolerable misery before him, yet he scorns to submit, and his stout heart, supported by malice and revenge, is consoled by the idea, that if God is to be his eternal tormentor, to the same duration he shall be the tormentor of a large portion of mankind.

Such is a brief summary of the common opinions entertained of the Devil and Satan. Though the ancient zeal for such opinions has considerably abated, enough still remains to prevent me from being a favorite with the religious public for calling them in question. These opinions are imbibed in early life, and so nourished and strengthened by religious instruction as to prevent their being faithfully examined. But let them be candidly considered, and I have no fear of the result, for they cannot all be true. They are at variance with each other, and some of them are incredible and literally impossible,

unless the Devil be nearly equal to God. When brought to the test of Scripture, they are found wanting; having no better foundation than the doctrine of witchcraft, which is now almost exploded. The evidence of this we hope will appear in succeeding sections.

SECTION II.

REMARKS ON GEN. 3, SHOWING THAT THE SERPENT WHICH DECEIVED EVE WAS NOT A FALLEN ANGEL.

In considering the Scripture doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan, Gen. 3 first claims our attention. Those who are not familiar with its contents will please to read it. The common opinion is, that the serpent which deceived Eve was a fallen angel, who is throughout the Bible called Devil and Satan. This is taken for granted, and it will be considered vain and impious to call it in question. But I shall proceed to state facts and arguments, proving that this chapter gives no countenance to such opinions.

1st. Moses, in the two preceding chapters of Genesis, makes no mention of an angel who fell from heaven. If such an event had happened, he was either ignorant of it, or was not authorized, or deemed it unnecessary, to mention it. We may with equal truth assert that God created the Devil, as assert that an angel had become one, from anything Moses has said in these chapters. But ought not this to have been announced in them, if it be true that he is spoken of in the third as the cause of the fall of man?

2d. It is a fact, equally indisputable, that Moses does not say the serpent was a fallen angel. It is from what he does say that we can learn what he believed, and not from his silence on the subject. In chapter 2: 19, 20, it

is said, "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every *beast of the field*, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam, to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowls of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him." The third chapter begins thus: "Now the serpent was more subtle than any *beast of the field* which the Lord God had made." Any one reading these two passages, would conclude that the serpent was a beast of the field, which the Lord brought to Adam, and which he had named serpent. The connection leads to this conclusion, unless we suppose God brought a fallen angel among the beasts of the field to Adam, and that he gave him this name. But it would be foolish to assert this.

Again, let it be observed, that the woman did not accuse a fallen angel as her deceiver, verse 13. God says to her, "What is this that thou hast done?" She answers, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." Had either Eve or Moses believed such an evil being was the cause of her disobedience, would they have imputed it to a beast of the field? When God made inquisition, he traced the evil from Adam to the woman, and from the woman to the serpent, and here both stop. But had there been any other agent concerned, would either have stopped here? But again, Moses does not represent the serpent as a fallen angel in the punishment inflicted, verses 14, 15. God calls the deceiver of Eve, serpent. If a fallen angel used this reptile as a cover for his deception, he is not accused of the crime, nor does he suffer any punishment. From anything said in the account, we may as justly accuse the angel Gabriel of deceiving Eve, as a fallen angel, and as justly affirm that the punishment inflicted fell on the former as on the latter. Was this fallen angel to go upon his belly, and to eat dust all the days of his life?

3d. Moses does not give any information about an angel who fell from heaven and became a devil. Let any one read the five books of Moses, and he must be convinced that such a being is not once mentioned by him under any name. Had Moses only recognized the existence of such an evil spirit, there might be some ground for supposing that he thought the serpent effected the deception of Eve. But his entire silence on this subject forbids such a supposition. For more than two thousand years, then, such an evil being was unknown among men. Was Moses afraid to speak out on this subject? But pray, what temptation had he to conceal such information? If he knew such an evil being existed, had deceived Eve, was such an enemy to God and the human race, would he have been silent about him? Such an important fact, we might naturally expect, would be conspicuous in his writings. But will any man affirm that this is the case?

4th. Another fact strongly confirms all the preceding. No Old Testament writer says Moses, by the serpent, Genesis 3, meant a fallen angel. None speak of such a being by the name serpent; so that the supposition has no foundation. But I ask, had they believed as people do now, would this have been the case?

5th. In the Bible there are both allusions and direct references to the account of Eve's deception and the entrance of sin, but no intimation is given that a fallen angel was the cause of either. We shall briefly notice the principal of them. Paul, 2 Cor. 11 : 3, says — "But I fear lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

Paul here calls the deceiver of Eve the serpent, as Moses did, but not a syllable escapes him that the Devil used this beast of the field as a cover for his deception. If this was the orthodox belief in Paul's day, he gave no sanction to it as an inspired teacher. Like all the preceding sacred writers, he is silent about the Devil

seducing our first parents. But if Paul believed this, is it not strange, that, in a direct reference to the deception of Eve by the serpent, he should give no intimation that such a wicked being was the principal agent? But again, Job says, chap. 31: 33, "If I covered my transgressions as Adam by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom." But instead of the words, "as Adam," we have in the margin, "after the manner of men." But allowing the rendering in the text correct, Job gives us no hint that he believed an evil spirit was the cause of Adam's sin. Again, in Hosea 6: 7, it is said — "But they like men (in the margin like Adam) have transgressed the covenant." But a more direct reference we have, Rom. 5: 12—14: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: for until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless. death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come." Here Paul expressly declares, that by one man, and not by a fallen angel, sin entered the world. But again, he says, 1 Cor. 15: 22 —"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." See, also, verses 45—49. But still, he says nothing about the Devil, or a fallen angel, having any concern with either sin or death by Adam. In 1 Tim. 2: 13, 14, the apostle directly alludes to the third chapter of Genesis. "But Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman, being deceived, was in the transgression." The apostle here says Eve was deceived, but not a word about her being deceived by a fallen angel. He told us, 2 Cor. 11: 3, that the serpent beguiled her; and this is just what Eve said herself, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat."— Gen. 3: 13.

Such are the references made in Scripture, to the account given by Moses in the third chapter of Genesis,

except two or three passages, where we read of that old serpent, the Devil and Satan. These will be considered in Section VIII.

6th. But admitting such an evil spirit did exist, call him by what name you please, how is the character of God to be defended in not forewarning our first parents against his evil devices? It is evident, not a word of caution was afforded them. They had to learn his existence by the mischief he did them, and if God gave them information afterwards concerning him, it came too late to be of any benefit to them. Are we to conclude that God concealed the knowledge of such a being from them that they might be seduced and ruined? I should rather conclude that no such being existed. He did foresee the consequences of their being seduced, and guarded them against the true tempter, as we shall presently see.

7th. The fall of an angel from heaven, and his change to a devil, is certainly a very remarkable event. It is rendered more so, by its connection with the fall of man, in making him a sinner, and entailing, according to many, eternal misery on his posterity. The very nature of the case leads us to think that Moses would have related the fall of this angel, before he introduced the fall of man. But nothing like this is found. Allowing the existence of such a being, we would notice,

8th. There is no evidence in this account that a fallen angel knew that one tree of the garden was prohibited, and it is not easy to understand how a mere serpent could know it. Did God inform the Devil about the prohibition? Or was he present when it was given? It does not appear that Eve informed him, for the serpent began the conversation with her, and seems to have known all about it. This very circumstance, representing the serpent as perfectly acquainted with the prohibition, suggests that Moses merely used the serpent to represent something else, which will rationally account for this.

9th. Admitting, for a moment, that the Devil did as-

sume the likeness of a serpent, how does this accord with the policy which this arch-deceiver is supposed to possess? For his advocates affirm he can assume a much more agreeable likeness than that of a vile reptile. Besides, he does not seem to have chosen this appearance often since, for people represent him as appearing in various forms, but seldom if ever in that of a serpent.

10th. Unless we believe that Eve was on familiar terms with the Devil, and knew that serpents spoke and reasoned in those days, she was more likely to be frightened than deceived. A speaking serpent, or the Devil under this likeness, would terrify the most courageous female among us. But Eve showed no signs of fear, or even suspicion. She conversed with the Devil, or the serpent, with as much apparent composure as she could have done with Adam. The common belief makes her a perfectly holy creature; and yet how easily she fell, and by means of agents which almost all her sinful posterity would have resisted! What man, what female, now, would be deceived into disobedience by a speaking serpent, or the Devil under this likeness? If Eve could not resist such a temptation, how can it be expected her corrupt offspring can resist any temptation? All these things lead me to suspect this account of the deception of Eve by a serpent was intended to teach us something else; and that we are indebted to Milton rather than Moses for the common opinions entertained on this subject.

I shall now state for candid consideration my own opinion of this passage. We read, chap. 3 : 1 — "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field." The question is, What serpent did Moses mean? Chap. 2 : 19 would lead us to conclude it was a beast of the field. But it will be asked, Could serpents speak and reason in those days? I answer, we have no evidence that they did. It will be asked, What then did he mean by the serpent? I would answer this by asking, Did not Moses in this account mean to inform us how Eve was deceived,

and how sin was first introduced? To this all will readily agree. Well, the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field, and was the fittest creature which could be chosen to illustrate by a figure how Eve was deceived. Let it be recollected, Moses wrote this account more than two thousand years after it happened, and selected the serpent, celebrated for its subtilty among mankind. And why might not Moses use this creature as a figure for deception, as other scripture writers do the lion for ferocity, the lamb for meekness, and the dove for harmlessness?

It will be asked, Allowing this to be true, what deceived Eve, and which Moses here represents by the serpent? I answer, lust or desire. That Adam and Eve were created with appetites or desires will not be questioned. They desired or lusted after the fruit of the other trees of the garden, and ate of them. Nor would there have been any sin in lusting after and eating the fruit of the prohibited tree, more than the others, but for the prohibition. It was this, and this alone, which could render it criminal. Before the prohibition was given there was no sin in either. But this only provokes the question, How came Eve to desire the fruit of the prohibited tree? Answer: she could no more prevent herself having desires than she could prevent herself being made, or made with such appetites; and the very prohibition not to eat of this tree was calculated to excite curiosity and create desire after it. What man has not known the truth of this from experience? The evil did not lie in Eve's having appetites and desires; but her appetites and desires took occasion from the very prohibition, and in this way she was deceived and eventually sinned. What Paul says, Rom. 7: 7—11, Eve might have said: "I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said thou shalt not eat. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once;

but, when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." What does Paul here say deceived him? It was sin taking occasion by the commandment, or desire, which is the origin of sin; for lust or desire, "when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin."—James 1: 15. So in regard to Eve. There could be no difference betwixt Paul and her, unless we suppose one of two things. First, That Eve was created without lust or desire altogether, which was certainly not the case. Or, second, That she was incapable of desiring what God had prohibited. If so, then she would have been incapable of sinning. The event proved that she was not. It should ever be kept in view, that sin does not consist in having lust or desire, nor even in being tempted to gratify desire contrary to the commandment, but in complying with the temptation. Jesus Christ had desire and was tempted, but resisted the temptation, as will appear in Section VII.

If the serpent, then, was more subtle than any beast of the field, it was the fittest creature which could be selected to show the deceit of lust. In this view, the whole dialogue between Eve and her own lust is both striking and natural. The serpent, or Eve's lust after the fruit, says, "Yea, hath God said, ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?" Thus her lust takes occasion by the commandment to desire the fruit. But Eve knew the commandment, hence she replied to her lust: "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden; but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die." To this lust replied: "Ye shall not surely die; for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Permit me to ask, could anything be more fitly chosen to describe the artful, plausible insinuations of lust or desire after some

forbidden object? But the woman ceases to oppose her lust by reasoning further on the subject. "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." From its being said, "The woman saw that the tree was good for food," some have concluded that she saw a serpent eat of the fruit, and, no evil following, she concluded it must be good for her food also. If this is true, it was calculated to excite desire in her, and embolden her to proceed. It was also an additional reason for introducing the serpent into this account. If the word "saw" is here used in the sense of considered, as is evidently its sense in some other parts of Scripture, she must then have considered, or inferred, that the fruit was good for food from seeing the serpent eat, or drawn this conclusion from looking at the fruit, and the reasonings of her own lust or desire about it. The last I am inclined to think was the case. But let these things be as they may, it is certain the tree appeared pleasant to her eye, and a tree to be desired to make one wise. This her lust told her. All know lust is subtle and eloquent in its persuasions, and never fails to promise that we shall be wiser and happier by its indulgence. Eve was overcome by the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eye. She ate, and gave also to her husband, and he did eat. He hearkened to the voice of his wife, and thus "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was (first) in the transgression."—1 Tim. 2: 14.

It will, likely, be said, Plausible as this appears, what evidence have we that Eve's lust is here represented by the serpent, and that this dialogue was between her and her own lust? The evidence which inclines me to this view of the subject I shall very briefly state.

1st. I find lust or desire stated in Scripture to be the source or origin of transgression. James says, chap. 1: 15,

"Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." See also chap. 4 : 2. The conceiving of lust after any object never could bring forth sin unless that object was prohibited. Paul says, "I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust, except the law had said thou shalt not covet." — Rom. 7 : 7. It is the doctrine of Scripture and of common sense, that where there is no law there can be no transgression. Allow me, then, to ask, must not lust in Eve have been the source of sin, just as in us? Can any good reason be assigned why it is now the source of sin in us, but was not in her?

2d. Sin, and lust, the source of sin, are always represented in Scripture as deceitful and beguiling. Paul, Heb. 3 : 13, speaks of the "deceitfulness of sin," and declares, Rom. 7 : 11, that sin, taking occasion by the commandment, "deceived" him and slew him. And in Eph. 4 : 22, he exhorts to put off "the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." And as all the conceivings of lust are in the heart, it is said, "The heart is deceitful above all things." — Jer. 17 : 9. The serpent, being more subtle than any beast of the field, was just as fit to represent the deceit of lust as the dove is to represent the quality of harmlessness, or the lamb of meekness. Those familiar with the Scriptures know that many of the beasts of the field are used as figures in a similar way. For example, our Lord says, "Be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves." And it is well known that in Daniel and the book of Revelation the writers deliver their prophecies under the figure of beasts and other symbols derived from the material world.

3d. In after parts of Scripture the serpent is used as a figure for cunning and deceit. The word rendered serpent in the account before us is *Nehesh*. Taylor says it signifies the "common snake. But in southern, hot, desert countries, the snakes may be larger or more venomous than in the cold northern climates." It is used literally for the snake or serpent, Job 26 : 13, Ec-

cles. 10 : 8, Prov. 30 : 19, Deut. 8 : 15, Numb. 21 : 7, 9, Amos 9 : 3, Jer. 46 : 22, Mic. 7 : 17, Jer. 8 : 17, Eccles. 10 : 11, Amos 5 : 19, Numb. 21 : 6. The same word is used for the brazen serpent which Moses made, 2 Kings 18 : 4, Numb. 21 : 9. Also for Moses' rod changed to a serpent, Exod. 4 : 3 and 7 : 15. It is used figuratively for tribes and nations, and to express a state of subjugation, degradation, &c. Gen 49 : 17, Isai. 27 : 1, Mic. 7 : 17, Isai. 65 : 25. This word is also used figuratively to set forth the deceit and lies of wicked men. Please consult the following passages. Psalms 58 : 3—5, and 140 : 1—4; Eccles. 10 : 11; Isai. 14 : 29; Prov. 23 : 32. If the cunning of the serpent was learned by men from experience and observation, and was used figuratively for this purpose, why not also by Moses in this account in showing how Eve was deceived by her own lust? Was it not just as proper a figure to show how sin entered by the deceit of lust, as to illustrate its deceitfulness in its progress among men afterwards?

4th. The view given of Eve's deception by the serpent, or her own lust, accords with every man's own experience. We all, like her, have appetites and desires; nor is it sinful to have them, or even to gratify them in the way or to the extent God allows. But where is the man who has not felt the conceivings of lust within him after some forbidden object? And can any deny the subtle, deceitful influence which lust has had over reason and understanding? Yea, I appeal to every man, if something of a similar dialogue has not taken place with him and his own lust. Our consciences, if well informed, will reason and remonstrate against our desires, and in favor of obedience. And can the man be found who will affirm that his lusts have never flattered him into disobedience? In the very best of men, the flesh has lusted against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and made them exclaim, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?"

5th. The view I have given of Eve's deception accords with what is stated in the subsequent part of the chapter. The first thing stated is, "The eyes of them both were opened," as the serpent or lust had suggested to Eve, verse 5. They came to know evil as well as good by disobedience, but it did not add to their happiness and comfort, as was expected. Does not every man find this who yields to the flattery of his lusts and transgresses the commandments of God? But what deserves our notice is the account to which the offenders are called. Adam is first called up, and asked, "What is this that thou hast done?" He answers, "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." The woman is next interrogated: "What is this that thou hast done?" She answers, "The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat." What serpent beguiled her? I have said her own lust, taking occasion by the commandment, beguiled her. Let us see how this view accords with the sentence pronounced on the serpent. God does not say to Eve's lust, or the serpent, "What is this that thou hast done?" But, "Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life." * The sentence is in accordance with the figurative use of the term serpent. It would have destroyed the congruity of the account to have done otherwise. Well, let us see how this sentence agrees to men's bodily appetites and desires, as figuratively expressed by the term serpent. We have said that man was created with bodily appetites and passions. These were given him to be in subjection to God's will, and not gratified

* It is not necessary to suppose here, as some have done, that the serpent before this walked upright, any more than that there was no rainbow before the flood. The rainbow was only used as a sign that God would not destroy the earth again with a flood; and the grovelling nature of the serpent to set forth what would afterwards be the state of men's bodily lusts or desires.

beyond the limits which he prescribed. Eve, listening to them beyond this limit, transgressed. In her, and all who have followed her example, when gratified beyond this, they become degraded and grovelling even below every beast of the field. The real bodily wants of man are few, and their supply easily obtained. But to his artificial, sinful desires no boundaries can hardly be prescribed. These often are so low and filthy that no beast of the field is given to similar indulgences. Men's lusts and passions "are cursed above all cattle and above every beast of the field." Like the natural serpent, dust or earthly gratifications are their enjoyment until the person is created anew in Christ Jesus, and is led to place his affection on things which are above. What shall I eat, and what shall I drink, are the questions in which our bodily desires centre, and to have goods laid up for many years, to eat, drink and be merry, are their happiness. But the account proceeds: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." The seed of the woman here is generally understood to refer to Christ. What is the seed of the serpent? I answer sin; for "when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin." This agrees precisely to what Christ was manifested to do. "He was manifested to take away our sins." This will be shown in Sect. VI. The Jews, who were of their father the Devil, bruised Christ in crucifying him; but he by his death destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil. The enmity between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent is beautifully illustrated by such texts as the following: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts. Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh," &c. To bruise a serpent's head is to kill it. And Christ, before he delivers up the kingdom, is to accomplish the entire de-

struction of this Devil and all his works. See 1 Cor. 15: 24, &c.; Heb. 2: 14, 15, with many other texts.

I shall only add, to represent Eve as holding a dialogue with her own lust, can create no difficulty to persons familiar with the Bible. The beasts of the field and trees of the wood are, in the figurative language of Scripture, represented as holding conversation together. Nor is the Bible wanting in examples of persons holding dialogues with themselves. But I must suppress many additional remarks which I intended to make on the first three chapters of Genesis, as the remarks already made exceed the limits assigned to this part of the subject.*

* Horsley says, "If any part be allegorical, no part is naked matter of fact; and the consequence of this will be, that everything in every part of the whole narrative must be allegorical. If the formation of the woman out of man be allegory, the woman must be an allegorical woman. The man must therefore be an allegorical man; for of such a man only the allegorical woman will be a meet companion. If the man be allegorical, his Paradise is an allegorical garden; the trees that grew in it, allegorical trees; the rivers that watered it, allegorical rivers; and thus we may ascend to the very beginning of the creation, and conclude at last that the heavens are allegorical heavens, and the earth an allegorical earth. Thus the whole history of the creation will be an allegory, of which the real subject is not disclosed, and in this absurdity the whole scheme of allegorizing ends." — *Biblical Criticism*, vol. i., p. 10. We can conceive of nothing more absurd than this. In order to see the fallacy of his reasoning, let us apply it to the allegory of David, in the 80th Psalm. Suppose we should say, if this is an allegory no part is naked fact, everything is allegorical — Egypt is allegorical, the heathen are allegorical, God and heaven are the same. Who would not see the absurdity of our assertions? The story of the vine showed how God took the Jews out of Egypt and planted them in Canaan; so the story of the serpent shows how our first parents were tempted. — O. A. S.

SECTION III.

ALL THE TEXTS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT WHERE THE ORIGINAL WORD SHAITAN OR SATAN OCCURS, CONSIDERED.

THE passages where the term satan occurs in the Old Testament are now to be brought forward, and we urge the reader to observe if satan is a fallen angel, the serpent which deceived Eve, as is very generally asserted. We shall take up the passages in their order. Taylor, Parkhurst and all critics declare that the word satan signifies "an adversary." In this sense it was understood by our translators, for this is their usual rendering. It occurs first as a noun feminine.

Gen. 26 : 21. "And they digged another well, and strove for that also; and he called the name of it *sitnah.*" If the term satan be the name of a fallen angel, it is strange the sacred writers should first apply it to a well. Had the existence of such a being been previously announced, it might be supposed he was the cause of the strife about this well, and on that account it received this name. But nothing like this is to be found. The well is called *sitnah*, or satan, in the text, and we have hatred in the margin as its explanation. Hatred is the act of an adversary, and the context sufficiently shows why it received this name.

Numb. 22 : 22, 32. "And God's anger was kindled because he (Balaam) went; and the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him. And the angel of the Lord said unto him, Wherefore hast thou smitten thine ass these three times? Behold I went out to withstand thee, because thy way is perverse before me." The word satan in the original occurs twice, and is here rendered by the words adversary and to withstand thee. In the margin of the last verse we have,

"to be an adversary unto thee." It is obvious that the satan or adversary who withstood Balaam, instead of being a fallen angel, was the angel of Jehovah. It is, then, a remarkable fact that the first time the term satan is applied to any being in the Bible it is to a good being. But this is concealed from the reader by rendering the word satan adversary. It may be observed here, and the remark applies to other texts, that had the original word been always retained in the text, or had it been uniformly rendered adversary, we would have been less liable to mistake its meaning. Had the first been done, we must have recurred to the context and scope of the writer to ascertain what he meant by satan; and, if a being, what being was referred to. It would have been easily perceived some human adversary was referred to, or the angel of Jehovah, as in the passage before us. But the word satan being sometimes retained in the text, and sometimes rendered adversary, the common scripture usage is not perceived. Besides, people, from education and habit, have attached the idea of a fallen angel to the word satan, and the word always suggests the idea of such a being. But not so with the word adversary, which is its rendering in many passages. Accordingly, it is on the texts where the term satan is left untranslated that people have built their faith in a fallen angel. This idea has been associated with the word in their minds from childhood, and it is next to impossible to effect a separation. The term satan will suggest it, and the meaning of the word, its scripture usage, and the context of the places where it occurs, are not sufficient to destroy it. Commencing the study of the Bible with this false idea, all must see how many texts may be perverted, not from design, but from the influence of this false association. We know of no better way to correct it than to recur to the original sense of the term satan, and examine all the places where it occurs with their respective contexts.

Should it be asked, Why did not the translators of

our English version either render this word always adversary, or uniformly leave the term satan untranslated? I answer: had they always rendered it adversary, they could not so easily have infused into their version the idea of a fallen angel. Had they always retained the original word, its application to the angel of Jehovah, human beings, and things, would have led people to conclude that it did not designate such an evil being. King James, under whose patronage the version was made, not only believed that Satan was a fallen angel, but he wrote in defence of the doctrine of witchcraft.

1 Sam. 29: 4. "And the princes of the Philistines said unto him, Make this fellow return, that he may go again to his place which thou hast appointed him, and let him not go down with us to battle, lest in the battle he be an adversary to us." Here again the term satan is rendered adversary, and it is evident from the context that David, not a fallen angel, is meant. Nor need this surprise us, seeing the angel of Jehovah was called so in the preceding passage. Many people do not know this, but it would have been evident had our translators, as in other places, left the term satan untranslated. This is the first place in the Bible where the word satan is applied to a human being, and it is applied to a man who feared God. It need not then surprise us that our Lord called Peter satan, and Judas a devil. It is very obvious that the idea of a fallen angel attached to the word satan, is calculated to mislead us, for this term is used to designate the very best of created beings.

2 Sam. 19: 22. "And David said, what have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruiah, that ye should this day be adversaries unto me?" Here the term satan is used in the plural, and is rendered adversaries. The satans referred to are expressly called the sons of Zeruiah. Wicked men they might be, but no one supposes they were fallen angels. Besides, it is commonly believed, there is but one being in the universe who goes by this name; yet here we find the term used in the plural and

applied to men. In the New Testament we read of demons, and of a person possessed with a legion of them. But David does not say the sons of Zeruiah were demons, or possessed with demons or satans, but that they were satans to him. This shows clearly the term simply means an adversary, and was the sense David attached to it. We seldom if ever use it in the plural, for the unity of Satan is the common belief as much as the unity of God.

1 Kings 5 : 4. "But now the Lord my God hath given me rest on every side, so that there is neither adversary nor evil occurrent." Here the term satan is used in the singular, and is again rendered adversary. Solomon does not name, as in the preceding text, any person referred to, but the scope of the context evidently shows that he had in view human beings, who were accustomed to be satans or adversaries to Israel. David had many such satans to contend with during his reign, but now Solomon had none of them to disturb the peace of his kingdom. He therefore determined to build an house to the Lord, which his father was prevented from doing by his frequent wars with them. We shall soon see that Solomon was not altogether free from his troubles from such satans or adversaries.

1 Kings 11 : 14, 23, 25. "And the Lord stirred up an adversary unto Solomon; Hadad the Edomite: he was of the king's seed in Edom. And God stirred him up another adversary, Rezon, the son of Eliadah, which fled from his lord Hadadezer, King of Zobah. And he was an adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon, beside the mischief that Hadad did; and he abhorred Israel and reigned over Syria." In these verses the word satan is used three times, and is uniformly rendered adversary. The term is applied to human beings, who are distinctly named, Hadad the Edomite, and Rezon the son of Eliadah. The last was a satan to Solomon all his days. It would be ridiculous to suppose the term satan here had any reference to a fallen angel; for in the first case it would be to make him an Edomite, and

in the second the son of Eliadah; besides he was called Hadad and Rezon as well as Satan. It is of more importance to observe, God stirred up those satans against Solomon. Had only one satan been mentioned, and no name given to show who was particularly meant, it is likely some would have concluded that God stirred up a fallen angel against him. But here it is put beyond all controversy that satan has no reference to such an angel. We would then ask, ought not such texts, where the circumstances mentioned so clearly decide that this term designates no such being, to teach us caution in concluding that such is its meaning in any passage? When the word satan is introduced, and no circumstances are mentioned clearly to decide who or what is meant, is it rational or scriptural to say a fallen angel or wicked spirit must be meant? We should think not; and until it is satisfactorily proved that such a being does exist, no rational man would ever think of such a conclusion.

1 Chron. 21: 1. "And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel." Here, for the first time, the word satan is left untranslated; but I can perceive no good reason why it was not rendered adversary, as it is in other places. No evidence appears from the text or context that a fallen angel or wicked spirit provoked David to number Israel. If the rule in other cases be allowed here, plain passages ought to interpret doubtful and obscure ones, and common scripture usage of a word ought to determine in particular cases in what sense the sacred writers used it. It is then determined here, for no previous scripture writer has said anything about a fallen angel, or used the word satan in reference to such a being. And if there were any such reference, it would not be safe to conclude he was spoken of, for the term satan is applied to human beings in preceding passages, which might be the case here. In every text the question ought to be, What satan or adversary is intended? As the word is not translated, and the idea

of a fallen angel is associated with it in people's minds, and nothing directly being said to the contrary, it is concluded that this being provoked David to number Israel. Though the labor of proving this belongs to them, yet I shall offer the following proof to the contrary.

1st. If the term satan designates, in this passage, a fallen angel, it is the first we hear anything concerning him, under this or any other name. But it is evident Satan is not here introduced as a new and extraordinary being; for there is no evidence that the word is used in a different sense from what it is in the passages already considered. To believe his existence from the text, is to disregard evidence to the contrary, arising from scripture usages of the word, and the silence of all preceding writers about such a being.

2d. Had the word satan been rendered adversary, previous scripture usage would have led us to conclude one of David's enemies had menaced him with a new war, and thus provoked him to number Israel. It should be remembered that the strength of Israel did not consist in the multitude of their armies, but their confidence in Jehovah and obedience to his laws. In numbering Israel, David sinned greatly, as it intimated a removal of his trust from God to that of the number and strength of his forces. It has been thought by some that David's sin consisted in his wishing to establish a military government for conquest; hence he gave orders to enroll all Israel for this purpose.

3d. But what in this passage is ascribed to Satan, is in 2 Sam. 24 : 1, ascribed to God. "And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go number Israel and Judah." We are sure that God tempts no man to evil, James 1 : 13. Should it be said, God permitted Satan, a fallen angel, to do it, we ask, Where is the proof of this? The passage affords none, except the gratuitous sense affixed to the term satan, which signifies adversary. To say it here means a fallen angel, is begging the question.

4th. When David's heart smote him for his sin, he imputes no part of the blame either to Satan or God. No, he says "I have sinned greatly because I have done this thing." 1 Chron. 21: 8. Nor, do we find that Satan suffers any part of the punishment, or is threatened with any. Others suffered severely for his sin; but if Satan was the chief cause of all this evil, why does he escape all punishment? David does not plead his influence in mitigation of his offence, or the punishment it incurred. But if either God or a fallen angel moved David to commit this sin, why did no blame attach to them?

5th. But some orthodox critics declare that there is no reference to such a being in this passage. Parkhurst says, on this word: "I would understand it, 1 Chron. 21: 1, of a human adversary: compare 2 Sam. 21: 1, which perhaps may be best rendered, And again the anger of Jehovah was kindled against Israel, and David was moved against them by (one's) saying; or, rather indefinitely, and one moved David against them, saying, Go number Israel and Judah." See Dr. Chandler's Life of King David. Farmer, on Christ's Temptation, quoting from Dr. Chandler, says, "For, speaking of David's numbering the people, he says, if the Devil had bid him do it, I suppose he might have seen the cloven foot, and would scarce have followed the measure for the sake of the adviser."

Ezra 4: 6. "And in the reign of Ahasuerus, in the beginning of his reign, wrote they unto him an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem." In this text the word satan is a noun feminine and is rendered accusation. Notice, it is not the persons who wrote who are called satan, but the thing written. The persons who wrote were properly speaking the satan, or adversary, yet it is the written document, sent by them to Ahasuerus, which is called satan; for it was not them but it which was to appear before the king as the accuser or adversary of the Jews. Who the persons were we

learn from verses 1—6. "The people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building, and hired counsellors against them to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus, king of Persia." But we are told that "in the reign of Ahasuerus in the beginning of his reign," they wrote to him, and this writing is called a satan or accusation. The term satan, then, so far from being the appropriate name of a fallen angel, is applied to men's evil passions, the angel of Jehovah, human beings, and here to a piece of writing.*

In Job 1: 6—13, and 2: 1—11, the term satan occurs fourteen times, but is uniformly left untranslated. It is rendered, in the Seventy's version, by the word diabolos, devil. Here, say many good people, satan must mean a fallen angel — "for the name, the things said to be done, and all the circumstances mentioned, go to prove his existence and wicked character." We frankly admit that these two passages have more the appearance of teaching this doctrine, than all the other texts adduced as proof of it. We admit, if the devil of Christians is taught in the Bible, this is the place. We hope, then, that they are willing to abide by the result.

I have examined these two chapters, with all the care and attention I could command, and shall submit the result by stating and answering the following questions:

* Dr. Barnes, in his Notes on Job, fully confirms the idea here given. He says, "The word does not often occur in the Old Testament. It is found in the various forms of a verb and a noun in only the following places. As a verb, in the sense of being an adversary, Ps. 71: 13; 109: 4, 20, 29; Zech. 3: 1; Ps. 38, 20; — as a noun, rendered adversary, and adversaries, 1 Kings 5: 4; 11: 14, 22, 25; Num. 22: 22, 32; 1 Sam. 29: 4; 2 Sam. 19: 22; — rendered Satan, 1 Chron. 21: 1; Ps. 109: 6; Job 1: 6, 7, 8, 9, 12; 2: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7; Zech. 3: 2; — and once rendered an accusation, Ezra 4: 6. It was a word, therefore, early used in the sense of an adversary or accuser, and was applied to any one who sustained this character, until it finally came to be used as a proper name, to denote, by way of eminence, the prince of evil spirits, as the adversary or accuser of men." — *Com. on Job*, ch. i., p. 13. The Doctor has not informed his readers on what authority the word was used to denote the prince of evil spirits. — O. A. S.

1st. Who wrote the book of Job? Answer; about this there are various opinions. Some have ascribed it to Job himself. Others to Elihu or one of the prophets. The general opinion has been that it was written by Moses, and composed from materials left by Job or his friends in the Syriac or Arabic language. See Gray's Key.

2d. When was the book of Job written? Answer; It is generally agreed that it was written some time between the death of Joseph and the delivery of the law at Sinai. It is perhaps impossible for us to fix its precise date. Nor is this important in our present investigation. Those who wish to see the various opinions entertained concerning this, may consult Gray's Key, pp. 229—258.

3d. Was Job a real or only a fictitious person? Answer; some have held the latter opinion. I think Job was a real person; for, in after parts of Scripture, his afflictions are represented as real afflictions, and his patience under them is given as an example to us. He is spoken of just as Noah and Daniel are. One of the sons of Issachar is called Job, Gen. 46 : 13, and was one of Jacob's grandchildren, who went down with him into Egypt. If this was the person who forms the subject of the book of Job, it fixes, generally, the period in which he lived.

4th. Is everything in the book of Job to be understood literally, or is any allowance to be made for embellishment or allegorical representation? Answer; although I think Job was a real person, yet many things are set forth in the way of allegory. For example, God is not only represented as talking with Satan, but as influenced by him to bring accumulated sufferings on a just man without cause. These are brought in such rapid succession, too, as seldom occurs among men. Besides, there seems something studied and artificial. Only one servant makes his escape to tell Job what had happened, and, before he concluded, only one more makes

his escape to bring additional evil tidings; and just as he closes his speech, a third also in like manner, and a fourth in the same way, arrive, and close the first scene of Job's calamities. Besides, throughout the whole book, there is something very studied and artificial in the set speeches of Job and his friends, and even of God himself at the close. The writer gives Job just double the number of camels, oxen, sheep, and asses, without one more or less, which he had at the beginning; and he gives him precisely the same number of sons, and the same number of daughters, as at the first. And, finally, Job is left in a more prosperous condition than before his afflictions came upon him, and has a long life of prosperity. The book concludes without any notice of the removal of Job's disease, which by some is called elephantiasis, and was deemed by physicians incurable. Had the whole been matter of fact, and nothing in it allegorical, we hardly think such statements could have been given.

5th. In what part of the world were the scenes of the book of Job laid? Answer; we are told, chap. 1: 1, that "There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job." That this was in Chaldea or its neighborhood is almost certain, for the Chaldean robbers or freebooters are said to have carried away Job's flocks, chap. 17. Dr. Parish, in his Sacred Geography, says, "Bochart and the authors of the Universal History, and some others, place the land of Uz far south from Damascus, and almost directly east from the tribe of Reuben, and west from Chaldea, in Arabia Deserta." See his work on the word Uz, also Gray's Key. It is not of essential importance to determine the precise spot where Job lived. It is sufficient for our purpose that he lived in the East. See Job 1: 3.

6th. What were the religious opinions of the people where the scenes of the book are laid? This is a point of great importance. Orthodox men, who certainly did not write to favor my opinions, shall furnish the necessary

information. Prideaux, in his Connexions, vol. i., pp. 185, 6, thus writes: "Directly opposed to these were the Magians, another sect, who had their original in the same eastern countries; for they, abominating all images, worshipped God only by fire. They began first in Persia, and there and in India were the only places where this sect was propagated; and there they remain even to this day. Their chief doctrine was that there were two principles,—one which was the cause of all good, and the other the cause of all evil,—that is to say, God and the Devil; that the former is represented by light, and the other by darkness, as their truest symbols; and that of the composition of these two all things in the world are made: the good god they name Yazdan, and also Ormudz, and the evil god, Ahraman: the former is, by the Greeks, called Oramasdez, and the latter Arimanius. And, therefore, when Xerxes prayed for that evil upon his enemies, that it might be put into the minds of all of them to drive their best and bravest men from them, as the Athenians had Themistocles, he addressed his prayers to Arimanius, the evil god of the Persians, and not to Oramasdez, their good god. And concerning these two gods there was this difference of opinion among them; that, whereas some held both of them to have been from all eternity, there were others that contended that the good god only was eternal, and that the other was created. But they both agreed in this, that there will be a continual opposition between those two till the end of the world; that then the good god shall overcome the evil god, and that from thenceforward each of them shall have his world to himself, that is, the good god his world with all good men with him, and the evil god his world with all evil men with him; that darkness is the truest symbol of the evil god, and light the truest symbol of the good god. And, therefore, they always worshipped him before fire, as being the cause of light, and especially before the sun, as being in their opinion the perfectest fire, and causing the perfectest light. And for this reason, in all

their temples they had fire continually burning on altars erected in them for that purpose. And before these sacred fires they offered up all their public devotions, as likewise they did all their private devotions before their private fires in their own houses. Thus did they pay the highest honor to light, as being in their opinion the truest representative of the good god; but always hated darkness, as being, what they thought, the truest representative of the evil god, whom they ever had in the utmost detestation, as we now have the Devil; and for an instance thereof, whenever they had an occasion, in any of their writings, to mention his name, they always wrote it backward and inversed, as thus, ʌhrɐmɐuɹ."

That such were the religious opinions of the people where Job lived, we should think indisputable, to whatever result it may lead. Ahraman or Arimanius, the evil principle deified, was the evil god of the people. The only objection which will be stated against this is that Job lived at too early a period for the opinions advanced in this quotation. But in answer I would remark, first, that Job's day was not too early for Sabianism or the worship of idols, for this existed in Abraham's day; and when Israel entered Canaan the worship of idols prevailed among the inhabitants. Prideaux speaks of Sabianism as opposite to Magianism, but does not intimate that the former was of a more ancient date. On the contrary, we shall see, in the next Section, that when Zoroaster arose and revived the Magian religion, he revived that which for "many ages" had been the established religion of Persia. In this account Satan is not represented as a new or extraordinary being, who had never been heard of before. It is taken for granted that the people where the scenes of the book are laid, were familiar with him, and the opinions expressed concerning him.

But what shows such opinions prevailed where Job lived, are the facts and circumstances mentioned in the account itself. These we shall notice presently. Here I would only say that it is evident Satan is introduced

as an evil being, and it is generally contended that he was the author of all Job's afflictions. This perfectly agrees to the opinions of the Magians, as stated by Prideaux. Besides, previous scripture usage of the term satan shows that the sacred writers recognized neither an evil god nor a fallen angel under this name. Where, let me ask, do any of them intimate that an evil being, such as the Persian evil god, or the Christian's Devil, existed as a rival to Jehovah? To what else then could the writer refer, but to such heathen opinions? If such a being as the Christian's Devil existed, how is it accounted for that he remained so quiet until the days of Job? Job appears to have been the first man he ever troubled. Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with many others, were good men, and rich men; but he never attempted to injure them in their property, or smite them with a single boil. They had no fear of such a being, and knew nothing of his existence. Had Satan just fallen from heaven, in the days of Job, and begun his depredations on mankind? Admitting this true, how is it that as Job was the first, so he was the last man he ever so tormented? The case of the woman, whom he is said to have bound eighteen years, is no exception to this, as we shall show, Section V. Let it be accounted for, then, why Satan had such a particular hatred against Job, above all other men before or since. It is easily perceived these things are rationally accounted for, on the supposition that in this account there is a reference to the evil god of the people among whom Job lived. Allowing this, the account is just what might be expected. The character given to Satan answers to that of their god, whom they believed to be the author and director of all evil.

The question which now comes forward for consideration is — Was this Satan introduced for the purpose of establishing, or was it introduced to refute, such opinions? Let Satan here be considered, either the evil principle deified, or the Devil of Christians, were such opinions intended to be sanctioned by the writer, or does he intro-

duce them to expose their fallacy, and establish the supremacy of the one living and true God in opposition to them? All, I think, will agree that the whole must stand approved or condemned. No middle path can be here taken, for no ground is afforded for it. It is, then, a matter of no consequence whether we consider Satan in this account the principle of evil deified, or the Christian's Devil; for I shall show, by direct and conclusive evidence, that neither of them had any influence in producing Job's afflictions. That they were all sent by the one living and true God, whom Job feared and obeyed, is evident,

1st. From Job's own testimony concerning his afflictions. Job's heathen neighbors supposed their evil god Ahraman was the cause of them. Christians believe their Satan or Devil was the cause of them. But does Job ascribe them to either? No; when one messenger after another is represented as announcing to him the loss of his property, and at last the death of his children, he says, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord." Chap. 1: 21. He does not for a moment admit that either Ahraman or the Devil had any kind of concern in his afflictions. He no more admits their influence in taking away his property and children, than in the bestowment of them. The giving and taking them away are alike ascribed to Jehovah. Similar were his views and feelings when afflicted with sore boils. His wife desired him to curse God and die; but he says to her—"Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh. What! shall we receive good at the hand of God, and shall we not receive evil?" Job 2: 9, 10. Does this look like acknowledging the Persian evil god or the Christian's Devil? Notwithstanding the popular opinions, that Ahraman was the cause of all evil, the severe bodily pain he suffered, and the taunts of his wife, he holds fast his integrity in the true God. Now, permit me to ask, if Job had believed that either Ahraman or the Devil brought his afflictions upon him, why

did he ascribe them all to the true God, without reservation? And why did he not correct his wife's mistake, by telling her that Ahraman or the Devil ought to be cursed? But Job had no faith in either, and hence he told her that she spoke as one of the foolish or heathen women. Job allowed of but one God, and it is evident that his adversity and prosperity are both alike ascribed to him. See chaps. 42 : 10—12, and 1 : 21.

2d. The speech of Job's wife, and his reply to her, show that neither Ahraman nor the Devil was the cause of his afflictions. She no doubt heard what he said, ch. 1 : 21. Upon seeing him still persisting in his integrity, under his affliction of the boils, she was provoked at him, and in taunting language said to him: "Dost thou still retain thine integrity? Curse God, and die." On the word rendered to curse, Parkhurst thus writes: "The lexicons have absurdly, and contrary to the authority of the ancient versions, given to this verb the sense of cursing in the six following passages: 1 Kings 21 : 10, 13; Job 1 : 5, 11, and 2 : 5, 9. As to the two first, the Seventy render Berek, in both, by eulogeo, and so the Vulg. by benedico, to bless. And though Jezebel was herself an abominable idolatress, yet, as the law of Moses still continued in force, she seems to have been wicked enough to have destroyed Naboth upon the false accusation of blessing the heathen aleim and Moloch, which subjected him to death, in Deut. 13 : 6—12, and 17 : 2—7. Job's fear, chapter 1 : 5, was lest his sons should have blessed the false aleim; and verse 11, he says, ought to be rendered, "And indeed stretch forth thy hand now, and touch all that he hath, surely he hath blessed thee to thy face," that is, hypocritically; the verb being used in the past tense. The Seventy render it, "Truly he will bless thee to thy face." And the Vulgate, "Unless he hath blessed thee to thy face." Comp. verses 5, 7, and 1 Kings 20 : 23. Satan brings the same charge of hypocrisy against Job, chap. 2 : 5, which the Seventy, Theodotian and Vulgate, render in the same manner. And at

verse 9, his wife says to him, "Dost thou yet retain thy integrity, thy regard for the true God, blessing the aleim and dying, or even to death?" Thus far Parkhurst, whose remarks shed additional light on this account. They agree with the usage of the word which is rendered to bless in other texts; they also accord with the charge of hypocrisy which is brought against Job by his friends throughout the book. It deserves to be particularly noticed, that Job lived among a people who had a false aleim or god, and that a contrast, if not a contest, between this god and Jehovah is set forth in the account. The false god is spoken of as one, and not many; and what god could this be but Ahraman? For the Persians had only two, their good god and their evil god. That a contrast is set forth betwixt the false god and the true, is evident from Job's fear, chap. 1 : 5, lest his children should have blessed the false aleim, or god. It is also plain, from the speech of his wife, who, instead of desiring Job to curse the true God, expresses her surprise that he should continue to bless him, though at the point of death in suffering from his hands. It is apparent that she believed in Ahraman, and entertained the opinions concerning him as stated above by Prideaux. She was displeased with her husband for continuing to trust in the true God, at the gates of death, and even blessing him for his afflictions. In desiring him to renounce his confidence in the true God, did she mean that he should become an atheist, or live without any God? No; she wished him to trust in Ahraman, the author of all evil, and the cause of all his afflictions. Job despised him, and continued to trust in the true God to the last. She therefore wished him to abandon this confidence, and trust in the evil god, the true author of his afflictions. By doing so, he would become his friend, remove his afflictions, or terminate them by death.

3d. That this account of Satan is introduced to be condemned, appears from the reasonings of Job and his friends throughout the whole book. Job's friends, like

himself, did not believe in Ahraman, for they maintain that Jehovah, on account of his hypocrisy and wickedness, had sent such afflictions upon him. But, I ask, does any one of them ever intimate that Satan, whether Persian god or Christian Devil, had produced his afflictions? No; they are to a man agreed that they were the doings of Jehovah, nor do they insinuate that he used Satan as a tool in producing them. As a specimen of their sentiments on this subject, let the reader consult chap. 4 : 9, and 5 : 17, 18, and 8 : 3, 4. Job defends himself against the charge of hypocrisy and wickedness brought by his friends. See, as examples, chap. 6 : 4, 5; 7 : 20, 21; 9 : 16—13; 10 : 2; 16 : 11—15, and 19 : 21.

We may then appeal to every candid man, whether Job's friends would have been silent about the cause of his afflictions, if they believed them produced by Satan. And had they believed in Satan, or Ahraman, the author of all evil, would they have ascribed his afflictions to Jehovah? Besides, had Job or his friends believed that Jehovah used Satan as an instrument in inflicting them, why is nothing said about it, either in their charge or his defence? In repelling their accusations, would Job have failed to urge that his afflictions arose from Satan's great enmity against him, had he but suspected that this was true? All know that people are not very scrupulous now in blaming the Devil. Nothing could have been easier, or more natural, than for Job to repel the charges against him by saying that Satan hated him, and had thus afflicted him. Can any man, then, believe that this account was introduced to establish the existence of such an evil being, yet this be contradicted by Job and his friends throughout the book? If true, why not rather go on to confirm such a doctrine? Is it objected, "If false why introduce it at all?" I answer; for the purpose of refuting such an opinion, and for establishing the unity and supremacy of the true God. It is well known that false gods were often introduced, in Scripture, in contrast with the true, for the very purpose of exposing

their character. But, I ask, are any false gods ever allowed to be able to do good or evil? No; they are challenged to do either, to prove that they are gods. It is admitted, by every intelligent man, that in the after parts of the Old Testament, and in the New, there are allusions to the evil principle deified, or the evil god of the Persians, and to darkness as the symbol of this god. See a specimen of these, and how the sacred writers expose such a doctrine, Isai. 45 : 5—7; 2 Cor. 6 : 15; 10 : 3; 11 : 13, 14; Eph. 6 : 10.

4th. Job's afflictions are referred to, James 5 : 11, and his patience under them is set forth as an example to us, though not ascribed to Satan, but to Jehovah. Indeed, no sacred writers, these two chapters excepted, say or insinuate that Ahraman or Satan had any influence in producing them. But I have a right to demand why none have done this, if they believed, as most people do now, that Satan was the author of Job's afflictions? If they had the same view of these two chapters that most people now have, is it possible that they would have been silent on such a subject?

5th. However prone the Jews were to idolatry and the superstitions of the nations around them, it was a truth obviously taught in the Scriptures that their God was good, and that he had no evil being as a rival to him. So far from giving any countenance to an evil being called Ahraman, Satan, Devil, or by any other name, all witchcraft, necromancy, or appeals to any other being or power, stand condemned, and the Jews were solemnly charged to have no concern with them. Jehovah, and he alone, is declared to be the creator, preserver and ruler of all things and all beings in the universe. Life and death, sickness and health, prosperity and adversity, are all ascribed to him. See Gen. 1 : 1; Dan. 4 : 35; 1 Sam. 2 : 6, 7; Isa. 45 : 7; Amos 3 : 6; Micah 1 : 12; Ps. 33 : 13—15; Prov. 16 : 4, 9, and 21 : 30. The idea of an evil being, which Christians call the Devil and Satan, and different nations by a variety

of names, found no place in the Jewish Scriptures. That the Jews learnt such opinions from the heathen, we shall see in the next Section. In concluding our remarks on this account of Satan in the book of Job, let us compare what is said in it with the above quotation from Prideaux, and we shall see all that has been advanced strongly confirmed.

Let us begin with the term satan. We have seen that this word signifies an adversary. That person or thing is called a satan to another which stands in his way, or in any shape opposes him. Thus, the angel of Jehovah was a satan to Balaam, and the writing sent to Ahasuerus was a satan to the Jews. Satan, in this account, is represented as opposed both to God and Job. He was their adversary or satan. Prideaux, in the above quotation, informs us that Ahraman, the evil god, was opposed to the good god, and that this opposition would continue to the end of the world. He also informs us that the evil god was considered the author and director of all evil. This is precisely the representation here given of Satan. All Job's afflictions are supposed to be the doings of Satan. Orthodox people contend that this was the case, and that Satan is their Devil. They have, then, got a heathen god, or the principle of evil deified, a mere nonentity, for a Devil. But is this very honorable to Christianity? And is it like persons who reverence the word of God, flatly to contradict Job, in ascribing afflictions to Satan which he ascribes to Jehovah? Job contends that the good God was the author of his afflictions as well as his prosperity. Those who believed in the evil god did not deny but the good God was the author of his prosperity, but would not admit him to be the author of his adversity. Job maintained that Jehovah was the author of both, blessing his name when he took away as well as when he gave. By this the excellency of his character was made manifest.

But again: In the above quotation from Prideaux it is not alleged that the good and evil gods always pro-

duced good and evil by their own immediate agency, but that these were brought about by the instrumentality of second causes. Though Job ascribes his prosperity and adversity to Jehovah, yet he and all the scripture writers represent him as accomplishing both by means. Looking at the first two chapters of Job, the agents by which Job's afflictions were produced are distinctly mentioned. For example, the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters carried away his flocks. Were not they then a satan to Job, in the common scripture usage of this term? And does not their very manner of life exactly agree to what Satan says, chap. 1: 7, "And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou?" Well, what answer does he make? He says, "From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it." Just such an answer as those freebooters would have given, for it was their mode of life to roam about committing such depredations. Yea, satan is the very name given to such persons in the East to this day. Messrs. Fisk and King, two of the Palestine missionaries, thus write: "For two hours, however, as we moved along, our attendants were engaged in loud and violent disputes with these and other companies of Bedouins, who came up after they went away. They extorted a few dollars from the Armenians and Greeks, and at last took an ass from one of the Arabs. Our Shekh knew all these freebooters, and it is probably owing to his acquaintance with them, and his faithfulness to us, that they were so easily satisfied, and that we met with so little trouble from them. He says most of the Bedouins are much worse than these, and yet he called these satans (shaitan)."—See *Christian Spectator*, vol. vii., p. 222. Such is the account given us by two orthodox missionaries. If the writer of the book of Job did not include the Sabean and Chaldean freebooters in the term satan, all will allow that the ancient and present usage of this word in the East fully warranted him. We see, then, that there was no need for the assistance of a fallen angel to produce this part of Job's

afflictions. The agent by which he lost his children is as distinctly mentioned. We are told, chap. 1 : 18, 19, "that a great wind from the wilderness smote the four corners of the house, and it fell upon them and killed them." Such was the cause which produced this effect, nor do we perceive that the aid of any evil being was required to accomplish it. We may just as well accuse Satan of blowing down every house which is destroyed by a tornado. Job's sheep were killed by lightning, and it and the wind are agents in the natural world by which God accomplishes his pleasure, over which Ahraman or the Christian's Devil have no control.

Again; looking at this account, and comparing it with the quotation from Prideaux, we see why Job's boils are expressly ascribed to Satan, without any other agent being concerned in their production. All evil indiscriminately was ascribed to the evil god, or Satan, as all good was to the good god. But, as there was no visible agent to which the boils could be ascribed, no agent in this case is mentioned. Satan, or the evil god, has to father this affliction himself, without the assistance of any agent. Hence it is said, Satan smote Job with the boils, which is not said respecting his other afflictions, though the whole aspect of the account is in agreement with considering him the author and director of all evil. I shall only add, that it has always appeared strange that in this account Satan should be represented as conversing freely and familiarly with God. But, if the account be as I have stated, the good and evil gods are here only represented as conversing together. It was in unison with the popular opinions concerning them.

In concluding our remarks, let us briefly notice some points of similarity in the Magian creed, to those of Christian creeds in the present day.

The Persians then had one good being or god, and also one evil being; or, as Prideaux observes, "that is to say, God and the Devil." Christians in this are perfectly agreed with them, for they believe in one God, and also

one Devil. Again; the Persians believed that these two gods were the authors of all good and evil in the world. In this also Christians agree with them, for all good they ascribe to God, and impute all evil to Satan or the Devil. Further; the Persians made darkness the symbol of their evil god. So do Christians. When they speak of the Devil he is described as black, dark, and hideous, and as loving darkness, dwelling in darkness, and keeping men in darkness, and will lead them at last into eternal darkness. Again; the Persians believed that their good god was eternal. Some believed, also, that their evil god was eternal. About this there was a difference of opinion. So all Christians believe their God to be eternal; but about the Devil there is a difference of opinion. Though none of them believe him to have been from all eternity, yet some of them believe that he is to live forever, and shall remain eternally the same wicked being. Others of them think that, after a long period of punishment, he will be either struck out of existence, or be redeemed and made eternally happy. But, again, the Persians believed that there was a continual opposition between their good god and evil god, and that this should continue to the end of the world. Then the good god shall overcome the evil god, and thenceforward each of them shall have his world to himself; that is, the good god his world with all good men with him, and the evil god his world with all evil men with him. Christians contend that there is a continual opposition between their God and the Devil, and that this opposition shall continue to the end of the world. Then God is to overcome the Devil, and from that time henceforward, God is to have his world and all good men with him, and the Devil is to have his world and all wicked men with him. Such are a few of the leading points of similarity between the ancient Magian faith and the faith of Christians in our day, respecting God, the Devil, and future punishment. It is but proper and fair to notice,

2d. Some of the points of dissimilarity between them.

The Magians believed that their good and evil gods were only "two principles." These principles they not only personified, but deified and worshipped. When Xerxes prayed for evil on his enemies, "he addressed his prayer to Arimanius, the evil god, and not to Ormasdes, their good god." Christians believe their God and the Devil to be, not two principles, but two beings. Their Devil is not only a being, but was once an angelic being, but for his sin and rebellion was cast out of heaven. Christians do not worship their Devil. But, alas! too many, who profess to be Christians, like Xerxes, when they wish evil on their enemies, pray to the Devil. Christians have a great number of names for their Devil. But it is apparent that whether such a being is called Ahraman, Arimanius, Satan, or Devil, the leading features of his character among all nations are the same. The evil god has become the Christian's Devil. In fact, they make their Devil the worst being; for though it was believed that their evil god should at the end of the world have a world to himself with all wicked men, yet it does not appear that they believed he was to be their eternal tormentor. But it is well known that this is a principal article in most orthodox creeds, and no man would be deemed orthodox who denied it. I shall only add that though the Persians and Christians agree in hating Ahraman or the Devil, yet the latter have not carried their hatred so far as to write the Devil's name inverted. In the next Section we shall see that the Magian creed was much improved by Zoroaster, and that Christians have not only adopted his sentiments, but the very language in which he expressed them.

Psalm 38 : 20, comes next to be considered. "They also that render evil for good are mine adversaries." Here the word satan occurs in the plural, and is rendered as usual adversaries. It is useless to make any remarks on this text, for its context clearly shows that David is not speaking of fallen angels, but of men. In verse 19 he calls them his enemies, and speaks of them as lively, strong, and multiplied.

Psalm 71: 13. "Let them be confounded and consumed that are adversaries to my soul." The word satan is also used here in the plural, and is again rendered adversaries. In verse 10, David calls these satans or adversaries his enemies, and the whole psalm shows that he is not speaking of wicked spirits, but of wicked men.

Psalm 109: 4. "For my love they are my adversaries." Here again the word satan occurs in the plural form, and is rendered adversaries. It is generally contended that this psalm relates to Christ and his adversaries, or satans. It is certain that verse 8 is quoted Acts 1, and is applied to Judas. This term occurs in several other parts of the psalm which we shall briefly notice. In verse 6 it is said, "Set thou a wicked man over him, and let Satan stand at his right hand." Here the word satan is left untranslated, but is rendered adversary in the margin. In the Jewish mode of parallelism a wicked man in the first part of the verse is the same as satan in the second. For an illustration of what is said about satan, or a wicked man, standing at his right hand when he shall be judged, in verse 7, see on Zech. 3: 1, 2, below. In verse 20 it is said, "Let this be the reward of mine adversaries from the Lord, and of them that speak evil against my soul." The word satan is here again used in the plural, and rendered adversaries. It is rendered in the same way, verse 29. "Let mine adversaries be clothed with shame, and let them cover themselves with their own confusion as with a mantle." On the whole of this psalm, and the use of the term satan in it, we would merely remark that no person who reads it can suppose that there is the least reference to a fallen angel. It is evident, if the psalm refers to the Messiah, Judas and the persecuting Jews are designated by the term satan; and shows us the propriety of the terms devil and satan being applied to them in the New Testament, as we shall afterwards see.

Zech. 3: 1, 2, is the last place where the term satan

occurs in the Old Testament. "And he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" Here the word satan is again left untranslated, except in verse 1, where it is rendered "to resist him." In the margin it is to "be his adversary." In the Seventy's version, the word satan is throughout this passage rendered diabolos. On the whole of it I remark,

1st. Let the word satan be only rendered adversary throughout these verses, and the idea of a fallen angel vanishes. The reader can easily put this remark to the trial, by substituting the term adversary for satan, in reading the passage. From our habit of associating the idea of a fallen angel with the term satan, and not with the word adversary, this and some other texts are supposed to teach such a doctrine. But can this false association establish it?

2d. If it were necessary, it could be shown what satan or adversary was meant. Let any one read Ezra, chaps. 3 and 4, and note particularly what is said concerning Tatnai and Shethar-boznai, in chap. 5, and little doubt can remain that they were the satan or adversary referred to. It is allowed that Zechariah prophesied about the time the events in the book of Ezra took place. Compare with this what is said on Ezra 4: 6, above. If people will interpret this passage literally of a fallen angel, why not also interpret the following chapters, in the same book, literally? See chaps. 1, 2, 5, 6.

3d. In this passage and in Psa. 109: 6, above, Jahn thinks there is an allusion to the forms of judicial trials in ancient times. He thus writes: "The ceremonies which were observed in conducting a judicial trial were as follows: — 1. The accuser and the accused both made their appearance before the judge or judges, Deut. 25: 1, who sat with legs crossed upon the floor, which was

furnished for their accommodation with carpet and cushions. A secretary was present, at least in more modern times, who wrote down the sentence, and indeed everything in relation to the trial; for instance, the articles of agreement that might be entered into previous to the commencement of the judicial proceedings, Isa. 10: 1, 2. Jer. 32: 1—14. The Jews assert that there were two secretaries, the one being seated on the right of the judge, who wrote the sentence of not guilty, the other on the left, who wrote the sentence of condemnation. Comp. Matt. 25: 33—46. That an apparitor or beadle was present, is apparent from other sources. 2. The accuser was denominated, in Hebrew, SATAN, or the adversary. Zech. 3: 1—3. Psalm 109: 6. The judge or judges were seated, but both of the parties implicated stood up, the accuser standing at the right hand of the accused. The latter, at least after the captivity, when the cause was one of great consequence, appeared with hair dishevelled and in a garment of mourning."

Such are all the texts in the Old Testament where the term satan occurs. The reader can now judge for himself if it is ever used by the writers as the name of a fallen angel, who ruined our first parents and all their posterity.

SECTION IV.

THE OPINION, THAT THE DEVIL OR SATAN IS A REAL BEING, WITH OTHER CONNECTED OPINIONS, SHOWN TO HAVE THEIR ORIGIN IN HEATHENISM.

It has been shown, in the two preceding Sections, that the Old Testament gives no countenance to the common doctrine of a fallen angel, under the name Serpent, Satan, or any other. Indeed, we think it has been established that the account of Satan in the first two chapters of

Job was introduced for the express purpose of disproving his existence. A very important inquiry arises, How came such opinions to be imbibed by Christians, become so current in the world, and even seem to derive countenance from the New Testament? To account for these and other things shall be our business in the present Section.

1st. In the early stages of the Jewish history we read of witches and witchcraft. Injunctions are given against these before we hear anything about Satan or the Devil. But nothing is said about witchcraft, until the Jews were about to enter Canaan. Many of the injunctions delivered to the Jewish nation were for the purpose of fortifying them against such heathen notions, and preserving them in the fear and service of the one living and true God. See Levit. 19: 26, 31; 20: 6, 27; Deut. 18: 9—12; Exod. 22: 18. Comp. Isai. 47: 12, 13; 1 Sam. chap. 28. The inhabitants of Canaan were given to idolatry and witchcraft, and similar superstitions. But such a being as Christians call the Devil was neither worshipped nor known among them. They had abundance of idols, but no Devil or Satan, nor are the Jews cautioned to beware of adopting such an opinion. It is then a very great mistake, which many good people have made, in calling witchcraft the Devil's art, and in thinking witches and wizards were in league with him. Concerning this, Michaelis, on the laws of Moses, thus writes, vol. iv. page 89: "We must, however, entertain very different sentiments on this point, in reference to the time of Moses. For in the biblical writings prior to the Babylonish captivity we meet with very little notice of the Devil, and it would seem that the effects which he could produce on the material world were considered as but very trifling. The wizards of those days rather ascribed the efficacy of their conjurations to other gods; and therefore, in the Israelitish polity, witchcraft was commonly accounted a species of idolatry, and, of course, most severely punishable. Hence

orthodox theology, in the time of Moses, could look upon it in no other light than as an imposture; for no one could maintain that it operated preternaturally, without admitting the existence of other gods, and their power over the material world." The Jews, before they entered Canaan, knew nothing about the Devil. Nor did its idolatrous inhabitants, for he was not known in that part of the world. If then, as now, he walked about seeking whom he might devour, it is very unaccountable that he should not be familiarly known in Canaan, a land full of idols, and witches, and all manner of wickedness. It seems all these could exist in those days without any Devil to produce them. Nor is Moses, or rather God, under any apprehension that he would visit that country. We shall see that the Jews were obliged to go to a foreign land to find the Devil.

2d. The Jews were carried to Babylon, and spent seventy years in captivity. Here the Magian religion, revived and improved by Zoroaster, prevailed; and here we shall find that they became acquainted with the doctrine of the Devil, and with other religious opinions not found in their Scriptures. To this point I shall now turn the attention of the reader. Prideaux, vol. i., pp. 219—240, gives us an account of Zoroaster, his religion, and its success. He says, "In the time of his (Darius Hystaspes) reign first appeared in Persia the famous prophet of the Magians, whom the Persians call Jerdusht, or Zaratush, and the Greeks, Zoroaster. He was the greatest impostor, except Mahomet, that ever appeared in the world, and had all the craft and enterprising boldness of that Arab, but much more knowledge; for he was excellently skilled in all the learning of the East that was in his time; whereas the other could neither read nor write; and particularly he was thoroughly versed in the Jewish religion, and in all the sacred writings of the Old Testament that were then extant, which makes it most likely that he was, as to his origin, a Jew. And it is generally said of him that he had been a servant to one of the

prophets of Israel, and that it was by this means that he came to be so well skilled in the Holy Scriptures, and all other Jewish knowledge; which is a further proof that he was of that people, it not being likely that a prophet of Israel should entertain him as a servant, or instruct him as a disciple, if he were not of the same seed of Israel, as well as of the same religion with him; and that especially since it was the usage of that people, by principle of religion, as well as by long received custom among them, to separate themselves from all other nations, as far as they were able. And it is further to be taken notice of, that most of those who speak of his original, say that he was of Palestine, within which country the land of Judea was. And all this put together amounts with me to a convincing proof that he was first a Jew, and that by birth as well as religion, before he took upon him to be prophet of the Magian sect.

"He did not found a new religion, as his successor in imposture, Mahomet, did, but only took upon him to revive and reform an old one, that of the Magians, which had been for many ages past the national religion of the Medes as well as of the Persians; for it having fallen into disgrace on the death of those ringleaders of that sect who had usurped the sovereignty after the death of Cambyses, and the slaughter which was then made of all the chief men among them, it sunk so low that it became almost extinct, and Sabianism everywhere prevailed against it, Darius and most of his followers on that occasion going over to it. But the affection which the people had for the religion of their forefathers, and which they had been all brought up in, not being easily to be rooted out, Zoroaster saw that the revival of this was the best game of imposture that he could then play; and, having so good an old stock to graft upon, he did with the greater ease make all his new scions to grow which he inserted into it.

"The chief reformation which he made in the Magian religion was in the first principle of it; for whereas

before they had held the being of two first causes — the first light, or the good god, who was the author of all good; and the other darkness, or the evil god, who was the author of all evil; and that of the mixture of these two, as they were in a continual struggle with each other, all things were made — he introduced a principle superior to them both, one supreme God, who created both light and darkness, and out of these two, according to the alone pleasure of his own will, made all things else that are, according to what is said in the 45th chapter of Isaiah, 5, 6, 7: 'I am the Lord, and there is none else; there is no God besides me. I girded thee, though thou hast not known me, that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none besides me. I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I, the Lord, do all these things.' For these words, being directed to Cyrus, king of Persia, must be understood as spoken in reference to the Persian sect of the Magians, who then held light and darkness, or good and evil, to be the supreme beings, without acknowledging the great God who is superior to both. And I doubt not it was from hence that Zoroaster had the hint of mending this great absurdity in their theology. But to avoid making God the author of evil, his doctrine was that God originally and directly created only light, or good, and that darkness or evil followed it by consequence, as the shadow doth the person; that light or good had only a real production from God, and the other afterwards resulted from it, as the defect thereof. In sum, his doctrine as to this particular was, that there was one Supreme Being, independent and self-existing from all eternity. That under him there were two angels, one the angel of light, who is the author and director of all good, and the other the angel of darkness, who is the author and director of all evil; and that these two, out of the mixture of light and darkness, made all things that are; that they are in a perpetual struggle

with each other; and that where the angel of light prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness prevails, there the most is evil; that this struggle shall continue to the end of the world; that then there shall be a general resurrection and a day of judgment, wherein just retribution shall be rendered to all according to their works; after which the angel of darkness and his disciples shall go into a world of their own, where they shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds; and the angel of light and his disciples shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive, in everlasting light, the reward due unto their good deeds; and that after this they shall remain separated forever, and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity. And all this the remainder of that sect, which is now in Persia and India, do, without any variation, after so many ages, still hold even to this day."

On these extracts, and other things stated in the pages referred to, I shall make a few general remarks. Zoroaster, being a Jew, well acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures, and skilled in all the learning of the East, was preëminently qualified for the game of imposture which he played. He did not invent a new religion, but only revived and improved the ancient Magian religion. As Prideaux says, "He grafted all his new scions on this old stock, and they grew." The Magian religion "had been for many ages past the ancient national religion of the Medes as well as of the Persians." Zoroaster's improved system soon became popular, national, and generally prevalent in the East. Though at first it met with great opposition from the Sabians, yet he shortly drew over to it Darius, whose example was soon followed by the "courtiers, nobility, and all the great men of the kingdom." The time in which he flourished "was while Darius Hystaspes was king of Persia." The sect flourished from his time, which, to "the death of Yazdejard, the last Persian king of the Magian religion,

was about eleven hundred years. But after the Mahometans had overrun Persia, in the seventh century after Christ, the Archimagus was forced to remove from thence into Kerman, which is a province in Persia, lying upon the Southern Ocean, towards India, and there it hath continued even to this day." But for these and other important statements I must generally refer to Prideaux's account. Malte Brun says this sect exists in Africa, and that in Congo "the good principle is named Zamba M'Poonga, and the evil principle, which is opposed to him, Caddee M'Peemba." — *Geog.*, B. lxviii., pp. 274, 328. Impostor as Zoroaster was, he did not choose to make "God the author of evil." To avoid this absurdity he held "that God originally and directly created only light or good, and that darkness or evil followed it by consequence, as the shadow doth the person; that light or good had only a real production from God, and the other afterwards resulted from it as the defect thereof." But we shall notice some of the articles of Zoroaster's creed more immediately connected with our present subject, and compare them with the articles found in Christian creeds of the present day.

1st. Zoroaster taught that under the supreme God "there were two angels, one the angel of light, who is the author and director of all good, and the other the angel of darkness, who is the author and director of all evil." It is very evident that his "angel of darkness" answers to the Devil of Christians, for they believe their Devil to be the author and director of all evil. They believe he was its author at first in deceiving Eve, and has been its author and director ever since. Both moral and physical evil are ascribed to him. The resemblance between them is not only evident, as it respects the powers and qualities both are said to possess, but the very name given to them. It is well known, Christians call their Devil "the angel of darkness." Between Zoroaster's "angel of darkness" and the Devil of Christians I can perceive little or no difference. The Magians

first deified the principle of evil, then Zoroaster changed this god into an angel of darkness, and Christians have adopted him for their Devil; and, lest his origin should be lost in the lapse of ages, have called him by the same name. But the resemblance is further manifest, by considering that the angel of light and the angel of darkness "are in a perpetual struggle with each other; and that, where the angel of light prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness prevails, there the most is evil; and that this struggle shall continue to the end of the world." I ask all candid Christians, if this is not what they believe concerning their Devil? Is it not their faith and their phraseology that God and the Devil are in a perpetual struggle; — that this struggle shall continue between them unto the end of the world, and that God finally shall overcome the Devil? Who can deny all this? And what Christian man can have the face to deny that Christians have made a Devil out of Zoroaster's angel of darkness, for it was impossible he could make his angel of darkness out of their Devil? It is also apparent Christians believe, as Zoroaster has taught them, "that where the angel of light, or the good God, prevails, there the most is good, and where the angel of darkness, or their Devil, prevails, there the most is evil." Prideaux considers it a great absurdity in the ancient Magian religion, that "light and darkness, or good and evil, were the supreme beings, without acknowledging the great good God, who is superior to both." But is the absurdity much less among Christians, in holding to one supreme God, and a Devil whom they make but little inferior to him? It is true they have not two gods in name, for they do not believe in the Devil as a god. But what signifies a mere name, when in fact they ascribe to him all the characteristics of a god; yea, the very same as the ancient Magians ascribed to their evil god, and Zoroaster to his angel of darkness? Their Devil struggles with the true God, and is in a continual conflict with him, and is not to give it

up until the end of the world. In all past ages, they say that their Devil has had the ascendency in this warfare, for evil hitherto has most prevailed. — See Mr. Emerson's treatise on the Millennium.

I would suggest it for consideration, whether Zoroaster's "angel of light" is not a corruption of the scripture doctrine concerning the Messiah. He is called the angel of the Lord, and the angel of the covenant. Between him and the seed of the serpent there is a continual struggle, and this struggle is to continue to the end of the world, when all things shall be subdued to him. But, though he was manifested to destroy the works of the Devil — yea, through death to destroy the Devil — this Devil was not a "fallen angel," or "an angel of darkness," or "an evil god," as we shall see, Section VI. Paul, 2 Cor. 11 : 14, seems to allude to this tenet of Zoroaster's creed in saying, Satan is transformed into "an angel of light." It is implied that before this transformation he was "an angel of darkness," which are the very expressions used by Zoroaster. — See, on this text, Section V.

2d. Let us now consider what Zoroaster says shall take place at the end of the world, and compare it with the creeds of most Christians. He says, "Then there shall be a general resurrection." This article Zoroaster no doubt learned from his acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures, for the resurrection from the dead was the ultimate hope of believers in Christ, who was promised to the fathers. At this resurrection, he says, there shall be "a day of judgment." This Zoroaster could not learn from the Old Testament, for it does not teach such a doctrine, and when he made his creed the New was not in existence. The phrase, "day of judgment," used by him, is that now used by Christians, and in the same sense as he used it. In my answer to Mr. Sabine, I examined every text in which this phrase is found, and showed that it is not once used in the Bible in the sense which Zoroaster and Christians have attached to it. To

it I beg leave to refer the reader who inclines to examine this subject. Christians must have borrowed the sense they attach to the phrase "day of judgment" from his creed, for he could not borrow it from theirs, as the chronology of the cases shows. But let us hear Zoroaster about what shall take place at the day of judgment. He says, "Just retribution shall be rendered to all according to their works." It cannot be denied that this is the very sentiment and language of Christian creeds. But I ask, how Zoroaster could learn either this sentiment or its phraseology from the Old Testament? If he did, intelligent and learned orthodox men have erred greatly in admitting this doctrine is not taught in the Old Testament. Jahn, in his Archæology, thus writes, p. 398: "We have not authority, therefore, decidedly to say that any other motives were held out to the ancient Hebrews to pursue the good and avoid the evil than those which were derived from the rewards and punishments of this life. That these were the motives which were presented to their minds, in order to influence them to pursue a right course of conduct, is expressly asserted, Isai. 26: 9, 10, and may be learnt also from the imprecations which are met with in many parts of the Old Testament. The *Mehestani*, who were disciples of Zoroaster, believed in the immortality of the soul, in rewards and punishments after death, and in the resurrection of the body, at the time of which resurrection all the bad would be purged by fire, and associated with the good.—*Zend. Avesta*, P. I., pp. 107, 108; P. II., pp. 211, 227, 229, 124, 125, 173, 245, 246. Comp. Ezek. 37: 1—14."

According to this writer, "the ancient Hebrews" were not taught the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. But he honestly tells us that the "disciples of Zoroaster believed in the immortality of the soul, in rewards and punishments after death." It is true, the Andover translator of Jahn's work, in the paragraph preceding, inserts the following words in correction of

his author: ["And although he (Solomon) nowhere in express terms holds up the doctrine of future rewards and punishments, he informs us, in chap. 12: 14, of something very much like it, viz., 'That God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether good or evil.'"] Such is the proof adduced in opposition to Jahn of future rewards and punishments. Our readers can judge for themselves as to its conclusiveness. It leaves one serious difficulty unrelieved. How came Zoroaster and his disciples to speak so explicitly about this doctrine, if it was not clearly revealed in the Old Testament? No Christian can speak of it with more plainness than they did, if Prideaux and Jahn in the above quotations speak truth concerning them. Christians now use their very language in expressing their ideas on the subject. With pleasure we acknowledge our obligations to Mr. Upham for his translation of Jahn's valuable work, and this obligation would have been much increased had he referred us to the parts of the Old Testament from which Zoroaster could so clearly learn his doctrine concerning the immortality of the soul and future punishment; or, if he could not, account for this impostor's knowing so much more about it than the inspired writers. According to Jahn's account, Zoroaster's disciples did not believe in endless punishment. At "the resurrection all the bad would be purged by fire and associated with the good," was their belief; and this accords with the opinions of some Christians in the present day.

But let us hear Zoroaster about what is to succeed this day of judgment and retribution. He says, "After which the angel of darkness and his disciples shall go into a world of their own, where they shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds; and the angel of light and his disciples shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds; and that after this they shall remain separated forever, and

light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity." We have seen that Zoroaster's "angel of darkness," and "the Devil" of Christians, are the same both as to qualities and name. Here the sameness is still more manifest; for what honest man can deny that Christians have adopted his very sentiments and language? For example, Zoroaster's "angel of darkness" had disciples. Well, Christians say their Devil has disciples. His angel of darkness, with his disciples, after the day of judgment, shall go into a world of their own. So say Christians concerning their Devil and his disciples. His angel of darkness, with his disciples, in this world of their own, "shall suffer in everlasting darkness the punishment of their evil deeds." And do not Christians say the very same of their Devil and his disciples? Every orthodox man must believe that the Devil with his disciples, or all wicked men, are to suffer in a world of their own, "in everlasting darkness, the punishment of their evil deeds," and that "the angel of light and his disciples shall also go into a world of their own, where they shall receive in everlasting light the reward due unto their good deeds; and that after this they shall remain separated forever, and light and darkness be no more mixed together to all eternity." What man would be deemed orthodox who refused to believe these things? And why not allow that Zoroaster, the greatest impostor that ever arose, Mahomet excepted, was in these things as orthodox as they are? In these things he was orthodox long before them. There is only one of the above articles about which they differ from him in opinion. To the honor of our orthodox brethren be it spoken, they do not say that the disciples of the angel of light receive future blessedness as a reward for good deeds done by them here. No, they say, it is not of works, but of grace, lest any man should boast. It is true, the grace whereby they save men is rather a purchased grace than free grace; but on this I forbear remarking.

But it is added by Prideaux, "And all this the remainder of that sect, which is now in Persia and India, do, without any variation, after so many ages, still hold even to this day." If they hold all the above articles "without any variation to this day," and if they are all true, as Dean Prideaux asserts, why be at so much trouble and expense to send them missionaries? The chief articles in modern Christian creeds were propagated there many ages before the Christian religion existed.

It deserves the serious consideration of the whole orthodox body, whether missionaries ought not to come from Persia and India here to correct the innovations and additions made in the creed of the great Zoroaster.

We have now noticed some of the principal articles of Zoroaster's creed, and would ask Christians, from what divine source this arch-impostor learned all these articles of his creed. 1st. Was it from the Old Testament? This you will not affirm, for intelligent orthodox men allow it does not contain such articles. If it does contain them, you can find them there as well as Zoroaster, and we call on you to prove them from this book. 2d. Did Zoroaster learn such articles from the New Testament? This was impossible, for it was not in existence for more than six hundred years after the days of Zoroaster. 3d. Did Zoroaster learn them from God, when he pretended God spoke to him out of the midst of the fire? This cannot be affirmed unless you admit him to be a true prophet of the Lord. But he is declared the greatest impostor which ever arose, Mahomet excepted. 4th. Did Zoroaster invent these articles of his creed? No other alternative is left but to admit this, or prove that he derived them from the Old Testament, or by special revelation from God. If he invented them, then he was the author of the principal articles in modern creeds. 5th. Do you say your articles, so similar to his creed, were neither derived from him nor from the Old Testament, but entirely from the New? This will not do; for, even allowing such articles to be clearly taught

in the New Testament, it is evident Jesus Christ and his apostles had not the honor of first revealing them to the world. Zoroaster, the arch impostor, had published them all over the East, six hundred years before Christ appeared. If such articles are found in the New Testament, Jesus Christ and his apostles were indebted to this impostor for them. Should you say, Jesus Christ and his apostles derived these articles from God by immediate revelation, permit me to ask you, who revealed them to Zoroaster six hundred years before the Christian era? Did God reveal them to him? If he did, why not allow him to have been a true prophet of the Lord? And why not frankly own that Jesus Christ and his apostles did not first reveal such articles of faith, but that God first revealed them through his great prophet Zoroaster? Perhaps you may say, such articles were communicated by inspiration to Christ and his apostles, and it is on their authority that you believe them. Beware, I beseech you, of taking this ground; for this is saying, Zoroaster, a notorious impostor, invented articles of faith, which, six hundred years after their invention, God sanctioned as divine revelation. Was God indebted to an impostor for suggesting to him a religious creed suited to the Christian dispensation? For the honor of God, of Christ, and his apostles, yea, for the honor of Christianity, we hope you will not assert this. If Zoroaster learnt such articles of his creed from a divine source, it must have been from the Old Testament. But few will be found who will assert that it contains them, for this ground is abandoned by orthodox intelligent men, and their defence is drawn from the New Testament. But if their defence can be made from the Old, we request that the different articles be distinctly taken up and proved from it. Dan. 12 : 2, is the most plausible text which can be adduced, from which he could learn the doctrine of endless punishment. This passage will be fully considered in the Second Part, to which I refer the reader. As to Satan being a fallen angel, who deceived Eve, tormented Job, and has become

the Christian's Devil, we leave all to form their own opinion from the evidence which has been adduced.

Let it now be remembered, that while the Jews dwelt in Canaan they knew nothing about the Devil. If they did, it was merely by report that the Persians and other nations believed in such a being. They had precepts, guarding them against witchcraft, idolatry, and all the abominations of the Canaanites, but not one guarding them against that almost infinite being whom Christians call the Devil. How our orthodox brethren account for this, I am unable to say. On my views, it is easily and rationally accounted for. The Devil was the principle of evil deified, transformed by Zoroaster into an angel of darkness, and the Jews must go to Babylon to get acquainted with him. That the Jews spent seventy years in captivity there, is a fact disputed by no one. The question which then comes forward for consideration is, Did the Jews imbibe, during their captivity, and did they bring back from it, any religious opinions which were not taught in their sacred books? Were any of those opinions derived from the creed of Zoroaster, and was that now entertained concerning the Devil of this number? To see how this matter stands, we solicit the reader's attention to the following particulars:

1st. The Magian religion for many ages had been the "national religion of the Medes as well as of the Persians," as stated by Prideaux. About the time the Jews were in captivity in Babylon, Zoroaster flourished there, in reviving and improving it. Jahn, p. 391, thus writes respecting the time when the Jews were carried there: "When at length admonitions ceased to be of any great avail, and everything was growing worse and worse, the Israelitish commonwealth was overthrown, two hundred and fifty-three years after their separation from Judah, and seven hundred and twenty-two before Christ. The people were carried away by the Assyrians into Gozan, Chalacene, the cities of Media, and into Assyria. The kingdom of Judah was overthrown three hundred and

eighty-seven years after the separation, five hundred and eighty-eight before Christ, by the Chaldeans, and the people were carried captive to the banks of the river Chebar, in Babylonia." Prideaux says, vol. i., p. 65, that the Jews were carried to Babylon in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, which, according to his chronology, was six hundred and six years before Christ. It was not for want of a fair opportunity, if the Jews did not imbibe opinions not found in their Scriptures.

2d. When they were carried to Babylon no particular place was appointed for them, but they appear to have been dispersed throughout the provinces of that vast empire. It was not with the Jews here, as with their forefathers in Egypt, a particular spot being assigned them, where they lived all together, and could fortify each other against a departure from the religion of Jehovah. Their dispersed condition rendered them liable to forget their own religion, and insensibly imbibe the opinions of those among whom they lived.

3d. The very religion of Zoroaster had many things about it calculated to lead Jews to embrace it. It recognized the first principle of their own, the supremacy of one God; was the religion of the king, his court, and of all the nobility. It was popular throughout the whole empire. These, and other things noticed by Prideaux, which I forbear particularizing, all concurred to make the religion of Zoroaster very fascinating to the Jews. For them to oppose it was only to render themselves as odious there as I am likely to be among orthodox people here in opposing their doctrine concerning the Devil. Jahn, in his Archæology, thus writes, pp. 393–4: "The similitude, which existed between the system of Moses, and that of Zoroaster, which prevailed in Persia and Media, may be summed up in a single article, namely, that they both discountenanced the worship of idols. For, 1. That original beginning of all things, called HAZARUAM, was neither the creator nor the governor of the world, but the endless succession of time, which was rep-

resented by Zoroaster, as the supreme existence, ENS, or fountain of being. From Hazaruam proceeded Ormuz and Ahrimanes. Ormuz acted the part of creator of the world; a circumstance which caused no little envy in the mind of Ahrimanes, and induced him to mingle with the workmanship of Ormuz the seeds or principles of evil which exist. By the Mehestani, moreover, or followers of Zoroaster, not only Ormuz, but six AMSCHASPANDI, also innumerable spirits, dispersed everywhere, the sun, moon, stars, and other earthly existences, were worshipped without distinction. 2. If the example of the Medes and Persians, who worshipped Ormuz as the creator and governor of the world, confirmed the Hebrews in the worship of Jehovah, it was equally likely, on the other hand, to induce them to adore the stars and spirits, which occupied so conspicuous a place in the system of those nations; also the horses and chariots of the sun, which the ancestors of King Josiah, influenced by the example of the Mehestani, had introduced at Jerusalem, and, perhaps, to practise that species of Magian worship witnessed by Ezekiel in the temple of Jerusalem."

4th. The Jews, previous to the captivity, had been preparing themselves, in the school of superstition and wickedness, for embracing such opinions at Babylon. Jahn says, p. 392: "During the period immediately preceding their overthrow, every kind of superstition and every moral pollution prevailed in both kingdoms, especially in that of Judah. No other means, therefore, remained to correct their vices, but that of extreme severity, by which their whole nation, dispersed from their country into distant regions, and humbled and afflicted, might learn that they could do nothing without God, and that idols could lend them no assistance."

5th. The long duration of their captivity unavoidably led to the adoption of such opinions in religion. It was known by the Jews that their captivity was to be for seventy years, and they were desired to make their temporal

arrangements accordingly. See the prophets' injunctions about this. But let us suppose, what is hardly supposable, that all the persons who went to Babylon over twenty years of age were proof against imbibing any false opinion. Suffer me to ask, how were all under that age, and all born there, to be preserved? Without a constant miracle they could not, and no one affirms that a miracle was wrought to preserve them. It is, then, morally certain that the Jews, on their return, must bring back with them many of the religious opinions of the people among whom they had lived, unless we can prove that they changed all their religious opinions as easily as a man can shift his clothing.

6th. Prideaux shows, from the Old Testament Scriptures, that some of Jews had gone over to the Magian religion. He refers to Ezek. 8 : 16, where the prophet, being carried in vision to Jerusalem, saw "about five and twenty men standing between the porch and the altar, with their backs towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces towards the east; and they worshipped the sun. The meaning of which is, that they had turned their backs upon the true worship of God, and had gone over to that of the Magians." Here, then, is direct proof of the fact from Scripture, that Zoroaster's religion was not only imbibed, but the worship it enjoined practised by the Jews. But as very little of the Old Testament was written after the captivity, we observe,

7th. That learned men agree that the Jews brought back from their captivity religious opinions not taught in their Scriptures. I shall only quote the following writers in proof. Michaelis, on the Laws of Moses, vol. ii., p. 348, thus writes: "In the New Testament, indeed, and in the Jewish language, after the period of the Babylonish captivity, from which the Israelites returned much enriched in names for the Devil, Belial means the Devil. But in the Old Testament it never has this meaning." Again; L'Enfant, in his Introduction to the Reading of the Scriptures, p. 14, thus writes: "But this much is

certain, that from that time (of Alexander the Great) the Jews began to Hellenize; that the Greek tongue, spoken by the Macedonians, became more common among them, and that they also introduced some of the opinions of the Greek philosophers, as the transmigration of souls, for instance. We find some steps of this notion even in the New Testament, as in Luke 16: 23, where there is an account of the abode of departed souls, conformable to the Grecian philosophy, and in John 9: 2, where we find an allusion to the preëxistence and transmigration of souls. It is, moreover, evident from the Apochryphal writings, from Philo, Josephus and the Talmudists, that the Jews, especially the Pharisees, had learned and followed the Grecian philosophy ever since their conversing with the Greeks under Alexander the Great, the Ptolemies, and Seleucidæ, his successors, who reigned in Egypt and Syria." Those who wish to see more authority in proof of this point, may consult Dr. Campbell's Sixth Dissertation, Part i., Sect. 19, quoted in my First Inquiry, Chap. i. Sect. 3. See, also, Jahn's Archae., pp. 235, 396. The Jews then had two sources from which they derived opinions in religion not taught in their Scriptures; the opinions of Zoroaster, and those of the Greek philosophers.

8th. What conclusively proves that the Jews brought back from their captivity many opinions not learned from their sacred books, are the Apocryphal writings. Though not canonical, they are allowed to be the best writings extant, relative to the Jews after the captivity. To these I shall now call the attention of the reader.

1st. What were their opinions respecting evil beings or spirits? We shall begin with their use of the term satan. It occurs only in Eccles. 21: 27. It is doubtful what idea the writer attached to this word. The word diabolos occurs frequently in the original, but is rendered slanderer, accusation, &c., in the English version. See Eccles. 19: 15; 26: 5; 28: 9; 38: 19; and 51: 2; 1 Mac. 1: 36; 2 Mac. 14: 27. The only place where

it is rendered Devil, and which has a connection with our present subject, is Wisdom of Solomon, 2: 24. "Nevertheless, through envy of the Devil came death into the world; and they that do hold of his side do find it." The allusion here is to Genesis 3, and from this passage Christians have probably derived the idea that it was the Devil that deceived Eve. If they can show a better source for this opinion, we hope it will be done. Paul says, death entered by sin, Rom. 5: 12; and it was shown, Sect. II., that no Old Testament writer intimates that death entered by the Devil. Where, then, did the Apocryphal writers get this opinion? It must have been from the heathen, and it is evident this idea agrees to Zoroaster's angel of darkness, who was the author and director of all evil, death not excepted. In the Apocrypha, evil spirits are frequently mentioned. What child has not been amused with the account of "Asmodeus, the evil spirit," killing Sara's seven husbands? Also, of Raphael curing Tobit's eyes, and binding Asmodeus? And of the wonderful efficacy of the heart, liver and gall of a fish, which leaped out of the Tigris, the smoke of which smelled by the evil spirit, he fled into the utmost parts of Egypt, where the angel bound him? See Tobit, chaps. 3, 6, 8, 11. In Baruch 4: 7, 35, we read of devils, but the original word is not diabolos, but daimonion. But, as it is admitted on all hands that demons and the being Christians call the Devil are very different, it requires no attention from me in the present investigation. I would only remark, in passing, that people's notions about Satan, the devil, evil spirits, witches and wizards, must be from a heathen source, for none of them are admitted to be real beings in the Old Testament. On the contrary, they are there condemned as superstitions, and the Jews commanded to give no heed to them. Where, then, could the Jews learn such opinions but from their intercourse with the heathen? If the Jews imbibed the idea of witches in Canaan, and that of the Devil and evil spirits at Babylon, and such beings are mentioned in

the Apocrypha, are these sufficient reasons for our believing their existence? And is it possible that such beings can be recognized as real in the New Testament?

2d. What are the opinions taught in the Apocrypha about hell? The Greek word Hades, rendered hell, occurs, Eccles. 21 : 10, and 51 : 5, 6. Song of the Three Children, verse 66. Tobit 13 : 2; 2 Esd. 4 : 8; 8 : 53, and 2 : 29. It is the same word which is frequently rendered hell in the New Testament, and is synonymous with Sheol, also rendered hell in the Old. The word Gehenna, also rendered hell in the New Testament, does not occur in any of the books of the Apocrypha. By hell, in all the above texts, is meant the same as Sheol, the grave, or state of the dead. The idea of a place of endless punishment does not appear to be meant in any one of them. Indeed, such a place of punishment could not be learned by the Jews, either from the ancient Magian religion, or from Zoroaster's improvements of it, for not a word is said about hell in either. I have shown, in my First Inquiry, that Hades or hell as a place of future punishment was learned by the Jews from their intercourse with the Greeks. See Chap. I., Sect. 3.

3d. What were the opinions of the Apocryphal writers concerning the number that should be saved? Their opinion was, that all men "shall not be saved." See 2 Esdras 8 : 38—42. On the contrary, the Most High "made this world for many, but the world to come for few." See 2 Esd. 8 : 1. And in verse 3 it is said, "There be many created, but few shall be saved." And Chap. 9 : 15, "There be many more of them which perish than of them which shall be saved." No sentiment like this is to be found in the Magian creed, or in its improvements by Zoroaster, so far as my knowledge of them extends. Where the Apocryphal writers learned it I am unable to say with certainty; but Whitby, on Rom. 2, shows that the Jews, in our Lord's day, believed that none but Jews were to be saved, and they were all to be saved. They believed that all the Gentiles were fuel for hell-fire. My

opinion is, that this idea originated among the Jews, from their hatred of the Gentiles, and the high opinion which they entertained of themselves as the seed of Abraham. See Matt. ch. 3. No one, we think, will contend that they learned such an opinion from their Scriptures. Christians in time past have not only believed that few will be saved, but they express themselves pretty much in the language of the Apocryphal writers on the subject. Of late, Dr. Woods, Mr. Emerson, and some other orthodox writers, aver that the greater part of the human race will be saved. The number who shall suffer eternal punishment will not be more in proportion to the whole human race than those who suffer capital punishment, in any country, are to that of the whole community. We ought not to despise the day of small things. But this is a great thing, for, not long ago, it was the orthodox faith that comparatively few of the human race would be saved.

4th. What were the opinions of the Apocryphal writers concerning immediate punishment after death? That they believed the wicked were punished after death, is evident from 2 Esdras 7 : 47. And that it commenced immediately seems, also, evident from verse 56, and 9 : 12. Compare, also, Eccles. 18 : 22—25. This is precisely the doctrine of immediate punishment after death taught in our day. But, I would ask, from what source did the Apocryphal writers learn this doctrine? Not from the Old Testament, for it is now conceded by intelligent orthodox men that the Old Testament does not teach it. It was impossible they could from the New, for when they wrote, it was not in existence. Not from Zoroaster, for I do not find that his creed contained the doctrine of immediate punishment after death. Where could the Jews, then, learn such a doctrine? I answer, from the Greeks, from whom, also, they learned that Hades or Hell was the place where this punishment was to be suffered. See First Inquiry, Chap. i., Sect. 3. The Old Testament writers, so far from teaching the doctrine of immediate punishment after death, describe this state,

as a state of darkness, silence, insensibility, and that there the very best of men cannot praise God or give him thanks. Nor is a single individual ever represented as in pain or misery in this state. But the Greeks believed in immediate happiness as well as misery after death, and the Apocryphal writers believed both. See Eccles. 1 : 13; 2 Esdras 14 : 34, and 7 : 28, 35; 2 Mac. 7 : 14; Wisdom of Sol. chap. 2. See Jahn's Arch., p. 398, quoted above.

5th. What were the opinions entertained by the writers of the Apocrypha concerning "the day of judgment"? The phrase, "the day of judgment," only occurs once in the Old Testament, Prov. 6 : 34, where no one ever supposed it referred to a day of general judgment at the end of this world. But in this sense, "the phrase, "the day of judgment," is used by Zoroaster in his creed. And in this sense, also, it is used by the Apocryphal writers; 2 Esdras 12 : 34; Esther 1 : 11. That they meant a day of judgment after the resurrection of the dead seems evident from the following passages. The torment of the wicked at this period they believed to be "fire and worms in their flesh; and they shall feel them, and weep forever." See Judith 16 : 17; Eccles. 7 : 17. Comp. 2 Esdras 2 : 34, and 6 : 9, 25. Suffer me now to ask, where could the writers of the Apocrypha learn the doctrine of "the day of judgment" but from the creed of Zoroaster? for this is both the sentiment and the very phraseology which he uses, as has been seen above from Prideaux. It cannot be questioned that the phrase "the day of judgment" does not once occur in the Old Testament in this sense. If it is denied that they learned this sentiment from the creed of Zoroaster, show us from what divine source they could learn it? As Christians could not learn either this sentiment or the language in which it is expressed from the Old Testament, we ask, how came they by such sentiments and language, unless they derived them from Zoroaster's creed or at second hand from the Apocrypha? It will not answer to say, Jesus Christ and his apostles used

the phrase "the day of judgment," and Christians have borrowed the language and sentiment from them. No, this will never do; for, first, we have shown in our answer to Mr. Sabine, that in no text where this language is used is such a sentiment conveyed by it. But, second, if we were even to grant this, what would follow from it? It would follow that Jesus Christ and his apostles adopted the sentiments and language of the Apocryphal writers; or, to speak all the truth, that both were indebted to the great impostor, Zoroaster, for inventing both the sentiment and language for them some hundred years before. Yea, that all of them were indebted to the ancient creed of the Magians for this doctrine and the language in which it is expressed, for both are found there. Let our brethren, then, who contend for this doctrine, consider its origin; for to build their faith on the New Testament as its source, is worse than the Old; it makes the writers not revealers of a new doctrine, nor teaching one before revealed, but adopting a sentiment and language which originated in the Magian creed, and was transmitted by the great impostor Zoroaster and the Apocryphal writers to Jesus Christ and his apostles, and from them to all Christians ever since.

6th. What are the opinions taught by the Apocryphal writers respecting the duration of future punishment? Their opinion about this was that it should never end. Thus, in Judith, 16: 17, where, speaking of the wicked it is said, "The Lord Almighty will take vengeance of them in the day of judgment, in putting fire and worms in their flesh; and they shall feel them and weep forever." Bad as the ancient Magian religion was, it does not appear to have taught the endless duration of punishment. And, if Jahn is to be believed, as quoted above, Zoroaster's disciples taught that the wicked were to be purified by fire at the day of judgment, and made happy with the good. It is certain the ancient Greeks believed in endless punishment, and from this source, or the creed of Zoroaster, the Apocryphal writers must have derived

it. They could not learn such a doctrine from the Old Testament scriptures, for it is not taught there. Many contend that it is taught in the New Testament. Allowing it is, I ask how the writers of the Apocrypha came to believe it and teach it long before the New Testament was written? Did the New Testament writers adopt a doctrine, taught by Apocryphal writers, which they derived from the heathen? This to be sure would be doing great honor to them; but what comes of the honor, or credit of Christ and his apostles if this is admitted?

Such are the religious opinions found in the Apocrypha, all closely connected with our present inquiry. We would candidly ask our orthodox brethren, how those writers came to speak so clearly and explicitly on these topics long before the New Testament was written? As their information could not be derived from the Old Testament, where did they obtain it? Did Daniel reveal it to the Jews while they were in Babylon? If he did, why was it mixed up with such fables as are found in the Apocrypha, and transmitted to posterity by Apocryphal writers? And, if such opinions be true, why did the New Testament writers not avail themselves of such explicit information, and teach them to the world? No man, we think, will affirm that such opinions are taught so explicitly in the New Testament as they are in the Apocrypha. And Christians cannot well deny that the sentiments and even the language of their creeds bear a greater resemblance to what is found in the Apocrypha, than anything taught either in the Old or New Testament. Many doubt the truth of such articles. But could any man have disputed their truth, had the Apocrypha been a part of divine revelation?

7th. What were the religious opinions among the Jews, not found in Scripture, during the days of Christ and his apostles? The New Testament itself affords evidence that opinions prevailed not found in their Scriptures. For example, our Lord told the Jews, in general terms, that they had made God's law void through their tradi-

tions. See some of these opinions noticed in the quotations from L'Enfant, Jahn, and others, above. Other opinions we shall have occasion to notice in succeeding Sections. See, also, Whitby on Romans 2, referred to above. The opinions of Josephus concerning a state of future rewards and punishments are well known, and need not be quoted. Those who wish to see a pretty full account of the opinions of the Sadducees, Pharisees, and other sects among the Jews, may consult Prideaux, vol. iii., pp. 353—389. See, also, Jahn's Arch., pp. 402—404, 411, which my limits forbid quoting.

8th. The history of the Christian church shows that many heathen opinions were incorporated with Christianity, and increased from bad to worse, until what was called Christianity became worse than heathenism itself. The first converts were Jews, and vast multitudes of converts were also made from among the Gentiles. Such continued to retain many of their former false opinions. When Christianity became the religion of the Roman empire, men, formerly heathen priests and philosophers, became teachers in the Christian church, so that it soon became popular, but greatly corrupted. Those who wish to see this gradual corruption traced and exposed, may consult Dr. Campbell's Ecclesiastical History, Mosheim's Church History, Milner's, and others. The fact is notorious, and universally admitted. We shall conclude this section by noticing the following facts.

1st. The whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, which has so long been the Diana of the religious world, was the invention of Zoroaster. Prideaux, vol. i., p. 230, thus writes: "And whether it were that these Magians thought it would bring the greater credit to them, or the kings that it would add a greater sacredness to their persons, or whether it were from both these causes, the royal family among the Persians, as long as. this sect prevailed among them, was always reckoned of the sacerdotal tribe. They were divided into three orders. The lowest were the inferior clergy, who served in all the

common offices of their divine worship; next above them were the superintendents, who in their several districts governed their inferior clergy, as the bishops do with us; and above all was the Archimagus, or arch-priest, who, in the same manner as the high priest among the Jews, or the Pope now among the Romanists, was the head of the whole religion. And, according to the number of their orders, the churches or temples in which they officiated were also of three sorts. The lowest sort were the parochial churches, or oratories, which were served by the inferior clergy, as the parochial churches are now with us; and the duties which they there performed were to read the daily offices out of their liturgy, and, at stated and solemn times, to read some part of their sacred writings to the people. In these churches there were no fire altars; but the sacred fire, before which they here worshipped, was maintained only in a lamp. Next above these were their fire temples, in which fire was continually kept burning on a sacred altar. And these were, in the same manner as cathedrals with us, the churches or temples where the superintendents resided. In every one of these were also several of the inferior clergy entertained, who, in the same manner as the choral vicars among us, performed all the divine offices under the superintendent, and also took care of the sacred fire, which they constantly watched day and night, by four and four, in their turns, that it might always be kept burning, and never go out. The highest church above all was the fire temple, where the Archimagus resided, which was had in the same veneration with them as the temple of Mecca among the Mahometans, to which every one of that sect felt obliged to make one pilgrimage. Zoroaster first settled it at Balch, and there he, as Archimagus, usually had his residence. But after the Mahometans had overrun Persia, in the seventh century after Christ, the Archimagus was forced to remove from thence into Kerman, which is a province in Persia, lying upon the Southern Ocean, towards India, and there it hath continued even

to this day. And to the fire temple there erected, at the place of his residency, do they now pay the same veneration as formerly they did to that of Balch. This temple of the Archimagus and the other fire temples were endowed with large revenues in lands; but the parochial clergy depended solely on the tithes and offerings of the people; for this usage also had Zoroaster taken from the Jewish church, and made it one of the establishments among his Magians."

Let it be remembered that Dean Prideaux was a prophet of their own, which forbids the slightest surmise that this account is either misrepresented or exaggerated. But, while eating the fat, and clothing himself with the wool, arising from such an establishment, he frankly confesses that it was invented by Zoroaster, concerning whom he says, p. 220, "He was the greatest impostor, except Mahomet, that ever appeared in the world, and had all the craft and enterprising boldness of that Arab." A very good origin indeed for "Mystery Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." It was surely proper that the greatest imposition ever palmed on the world should be the invention of one of the greatest impostors the world ever produced. As it was invented at Babylon, published at Babylon, and imported from Babylon, it is very properly called "Mystery Babylon the great." After such a disclosure by one of the craftsmen, that man must be dead drunk with the wine of her fornications who still continues to cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!"

2d. Another fact is, that all sects and parties in religion are silent about the religion of Zoroaster. The ecclesiastical hierarchy has met with both assault and insult from almost every sect. But, in the course of our reading, we have never met with any one of them who ventured to expose it as an invention of Zoroaster. Many a prayer has been made for the downfall of Mahomet and the destruction of Paganism; but who ever heard a prayer made for the destruction of Magianism

or the religion of Zoroaster? But why not? Is it not because the creeds of the different sects and that of Zoroaster are very similar? From his Lord God the Pope, down to the lowest dissenter, all firmly hold some articles invented by Zoroaster. It would not do for any of the sects to insult the orthodox clergy by telling them that Zoroaster was the inventor of their ecclesiastical establishment, for all the orthodox sects are largely indebted to him. Dean Prideaux loved the inventions of Zoroaster, but called him the greatest impostor that ever arose, Mahomet excepted. Instead of abusing him, the religious world ought to erect a monument to his memory, for to him, more than to Jesus Christ, are they indebted for much that is counted great, glorious and good, in religion.

3d. It has been noticed by many as a remarkable fact, that before the captivity the Jews were prone to idolatry, but after their return, and ever since, have held it in great abhorrence. Is not this great change in the Jews, partly, at least, accounted for by their imbibing Zoroaster's opinions, which were opposed to the worship of idols? But this I merely suggest for consideration, and leave the reader to his own reflections on the topics which have been discussed in the present Section.

SECTION V.

ALL THE PASSAGES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT WHERE THE TERM SATAN OCCURS, CONSIDERED.

THE term "satan" among Christians is as much a proper name for a fallen angel as Peter and Paul are for two of Christ's apostles. In correction of this mistake, Dr. Campbell says, Dissert. 6: "Satan, though con-

ceived by us as a proper name, was an appellative in the language spoken by our Lord; for from the Hebrew it passed into the Syriac, and signified no more than adversary or opponent. It is naturally just as applicable to human as to spiritual agents, and is, in the Old Testament, often so applied." The truth of this statement we have seen, Sect. III.

It has been alleged that the New Testament speaks more frequently and explicitly about the Devil and Satan than the Old. Let us see how this matter stands. The term satan occurs thirty-four times in the Old Testament, and is fifteen times rendered adversary, or by some similar word. But, though it occurs thirty-five times in the New Testament, it is not rendered by any word. It is easily perceived, then, that this circumstance gives to the New Testament the appearance of teaching the existence of such a being, which the Old has not. But every man must see that it is a very false appearance, and is very much increased from the very frequent occurrence of the term devil, and the plural devils, to which, like the term satan, people have attached the idea of a fallen angel. But it is well known that the words *daimon* and *daimonion* have no reference to that being Christians call the Devil, but to demons, or dead men deified, as we shall see in the sequel. The word *diabolos* occurs in the New Testament thirty-six times. Excluding all the other places where the words devil and devils are the rendering of *daimon* and *daimonion*, all must see what an alteration it makes on the face of the New Testament. Even in our English version the term *diabolos* is sometimes rendered slanderer and false accuser, as the word signifies. Dr. Campbell, where Judas is called a devil, renders it spy, and *diabolos* is rendered in a similar manner by other translators. Supposing, then, that the words *shaitan* and *diabolos* had been rendered adversary and slanderer, or by similar words, it would have been difficult to find a fallen angel under those names in the Bible. In the Old Testament the

term satan signifies an adversary, and is applied to the angel of Jehovah, the evil passions of men, a piece of writing, the evil principle deified, &c. The term satan is used in a similar way in the New Testament, which we shall now proceed to show.

Matt. 16 : 23. "But he turned and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me, for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." See, also, the parallel text in Mark 8 : 33. Here our Lord does not say that Peter was possessed of Satan, that he acted like him, or that he was influenced by him, but positively calls him satan. But was Peter a fallen angel or wicked spirit? The expression, "Get thee behind me, Satan," is the same that our Lord used, Luke 4 : 8, when he was tempted of the devil and satan. There is nothing at all remarkable in calling Peter satan, as David and the angel of the Lord were called so in the Old Testament. "Get thee behind me, adversary" was highly proper language, for Peter was our Lord's adversary, not from design, but from ignorance and mistaken views, as is evident from the context, and also from the reason assigned: "For thou savorest not the things which be of God, but those which be of men." The Old and New Testament writers, therefore, perfectly harmonize in the sense attached to this word.

Luke 22 : 31, 32. "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat." Peter, in the last text, was a satan or adversary, and now our Lord told him satan desired to sift him as wheat. But where in the history of Peter do we find that an evil being ever attempted to injure him? But, if we consult verses 32—35, and verses 54—63, of this chapter, we see that Peter was three times sifted like wheat, by being three times charged with being one of our Lord's disciples, and he as often denying him. Peter's faith seemed to fail him for a season, but our Lord prayed for him that it might not

entirely fail. In Psalm 109, and other places noticed in Section III., we have seen that the unbelieving Jews are called a satan or adversary to our Lord. Here they showed themselves so by sifting Peter as wheat, for their opposition was chiefly against the Saviour. To assert that a fallen angel influenced the Jews, is to assert what cannot be proved by the text or context. Indeed, only render the term satan adversary, and no one would think of a fallen angel as concerned in this affair. Our Lord only says, "Behold, the adversary hath desired you, that he may sift you as wheat."

Mark 3 : 23. "And he called them unto him, and said unto them in parables, How can Satan cast out Satan?" See the whole context. The following remarks from Jahn are sufficient on this passage. He says, p. 226 : "Jesus, in Matt. 12 : 24—30, Mark 3 : 22—30, Luke 11 : 16—24, employs against the Pharisees this ARGUMENTUM AD HOMINEM, which has no bearing in this case any further than the refutation of the adversary is concerned. The ground of his employing this species of argument in the present instance was this. The Pharisees, if we may believe Josephus, taught that the demons by which men were possessed were the spirits of bad men, who were dead, and were commissioned on their present business of tormenting the children of men by Beelzebub. Jesus, therefore, replied, provided this were the true state of the case, that Beelzebub, by lending his assistance in casting out his own devils, was overturning his own kingdom. He then adds, that this powerful spirit, for such the Pharisees supposed him to be, could not be compelled to perform such an unwelcome task unless a stronger one than Beelzebub himself should first come, should bind him, and take away his arms."

Luke 10 : 18. "And he said unto them, I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." The following remarks from Jahn are also sufficient on this text. He says, p. 225 : "Jesus, in Luke 10 : 17, does not assert

the operations of demons in men, for he couples satans with serpents and scorpions, which places us under the necessity of interpreting all these words tropically, and of understanding by them cunning and powerful adversaries, who opposed the progress of the Gospel, but with all their power were unable to interrupt its advancement. The expressions which he employs are as follows. 'I see satan' — that is, all the adversaries of the Gospel, who are afterwards called serpents, scorpions, and the enemy's host — 'fall like lightning from heaven," — that is, from the political heaven, from power and authority. Consult Isai. 14 : 12, 13; Matt. 24th chapter; Luke 10 : 15; Revelation 12 : 7—9; see also Cicero, where he says to Mark Antony, 'You have hurled your colleagues down from heaven.' (The adversaries of the Gospel occur in Luke 22 : 31, under the name of satan.) 'Behold,' he proceeds, 'I give unto you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy,' — that is, of overcoming and subduing by your miraculous gifts all adversaries,— 'and nothing shall by any means hurt you,' — that is, oppress and overcome you. 'Notwithstanding, in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice because your names are written in heaven,'— that is, rejoice rather in the favor of God than in the power of casting out devils or of healing the most difficult diseases." In addition to these remarks I would ask, how many fallings from heaven Satan has had; for he fell from heaven before he tempted Eve, and fell again it seems while the seventy disciples were on their tour of preaching. But how did he get to heaven to make a second fall, and, while there, was he also walking about on our earth seeking whom he might devour?

Luke 13 : 16. "And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?" Jahn on this passage says, p. 227: "Jesus liberates the woman described, in Luke 13 : 12,

as bowed down with infirmity, without making any mention of a demon; if, therefore, a little after, he asserts that she was a daughter of Abraham, bound by Satan for eighteen years, the expressions are to be considered as figurative, being an allusion to the loosing of oxen, which it was lawful to do on the Sabbath, in order to lead them to drink, and having reference at the same time to an opinion among the Jews that all diseases had their ultimate origin, not indeed from demons, but from the Devil, that overruling spirit of wickedness who tempted Eve, and to whom allusions are made in Acts 10 : 38 and in 2 Cor. 12 : 7." Dr. Lightfoot, on Matt. 17, says, "that the Jews usually attributed some of the more grievous diseases to evil spirits, especially those in which either the body was distorted or the mind disturbed." Jahn and Dr. Lightfoot allow that such opinions existed among the Jews, and we have shown, Sect. IV., how they came to imbibe them. But no countenance is given to the truth of the opinion that a fallen angel was the cause of this woman's disorder. It is called "a spirit of infirmity." Dr. Campbell says, Dissert. VI.: "It is a common idiom among the Jews to put spirit before any quality ascribed to a person, whether it be good or bad, mental or corporeal. Thus the spirit of fear, the spirit of meekness, the spirit of slumber, the spirit of jealousy, are used to express habitual fear," &c. A spirit of infirmity, then, was an habitual infirmity, which was certainly true of this woman, for she could in nowise lift up herself "for eighteen years." This complaint medical men have called "the rigidity of the back-bone." Notice, when our Lord restored her, he does not command Satan to leave this woman, nor does he rebuke him, but says, "Woman, thou art loosed." Loosed from Satan? No, thou art loosed from thine infirmity. This bound her, and was sufficient without his assistance. Notice, further, that our Lord, in the act of healing her, "laid his hands on her, and immediately she was made straight and glorified God."

The ruler of the synagogue, speaking according to the true state of the case, spoke of this woman as laboring under a mere bodily disorder. He does not say, There are six days, in them come and be loosed from Satan's bondage; but, in them come and be healed, verse 14. He was filled with indignation because our Lord had healed her on the Sabbath. What was said by our Lord about Satan, in defence of his conduct, is predicated on two grounds; 1st. On the principles of common humanity, which the Jews exercised towards their cattle on the Sabbath. "Thou hypocrite," says Jesus, "doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering?" What was the inference from this? Ought not this woman, a daughter of Abraham, to be loosed from her infirmity on the Sabbath? 2d. He defends his conduct on the supposition that Satan had bound this woman. If they believed this, how could they blame him for loosing her on the Sabbath day? Who could resist these reasons? Accordingly it is said, verse 17, that "all his adversaries were ashamed; and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him." But let us suppose that Satan positively was the cause of this woman's disorder, what follows? It follows that our Lord, neither on this nor any other occasion warned men against his great power and malignity. Whoever contends that Satan bound this woman, ought to contend that all diseases are inflicted by him. If this be true, we are in a miserable condition. Medical men may scatter all their knowledge of the healing art to the winds, and henceforth learn to work miracles, or cultivate the friendship of Satan, as the only means left them of excelling in their profession.

Luke 22: 3. "Then entered Satan into Judas, surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve."—If Satan entered into Judas, was not Judas possessed of Satan? But it is a fact that though persons are said to have been possessed of demons, yet we never read of one

who was possessed of the Devil or Satan. But how could Satan be in Judas, tormenting the wicked in hell, and tempting all the world besides, unless we make him almost equal to God himself? And if he did enter Judas for the purpose of working evil, is it not strange that some good angel did not also enter him to counterwork his evil devices? Well, what satan entered into Judas? I answer, the spirit of opposition to Jesus, the purpose to betray him. The 4th verse shows this, for "he went his way and communed with the chief priests and captains how he might betray him unto them." See on the next passage.

John 13: 27. "And after the sop Satan entered into him." What satan now entered Judas? for it was said in the preceding passage that satan had entered into him. I answer, his fixed determination immediately to execute his purpose. It was just before the last Passover, Judas purposed to betray Jesus, and bargained with the chief priests about it, Matt. 26: 14—17. This purpose is called Satan entering into him, Luke 22: 1—7, and the Devil putting it into his heart, John 13: 2. But, from the time he formed the purpose, until he received the sop, none but himself, Jesus, and the chief priests, knew his design. At verse 10, Jesus says, "Ye are clean, but not all." Comp. verse 11. Again, at verse 18, he says, "But that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me." But, at verse 21, Jesus says plainly, "One of you shall betray me." This excited the inquiry, "Lord, who is it?" To point the person out, Jesus says, "He it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop he gave it to Judas." The words before us immediately follow—"And after the sop Satan entered into him." What connection could there be betwixt his receiving the sop and a fallen angel entering into him? But there is a rational connection between receiving the sop, and his determination to execute his purpose immediately. The delicate hints of guilt agi-

tated Judas' mind; but giving him the sop must have roused him to fury, as he was now openly exposed, and he departs to execute his design. The words which follow confirm this—"That thou doest do quickly." These words, though not understood by the rest of the disciples, appear to have been well understood by Judas. They hastened his departure; for upon hearing them he went "immediately out." But where did he go, and for what purpose? To his employers, the chief priests, that he might execute his determination. See Matt. 26: 47—50. What is a remarkable fact, and confirms the above view, Satan is never said to have entered into the Jews. And why not? Because they had always been a satan or adversary to our Lord. But Judas had been one of Christ's professed friends, and the same satan which had always been in the Jews, entered into him when he formed the design to betray Jesus, and also when he determined to execute his design. To this day, when a man acts a very wicked part, contrary to his former professions, we in popular language say, "Satan has entered into him." Besides, the view given is in agreement with the Old Testament usage of the term satan, where it is applied to the evil principles and bad passions in men.

Acts 5: 3. "But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?" It is not said that Satan entered into Ananias, but only that he had filled his heart. But what is meant by the words, "Why hath Satan filled thine heart," is in verse 4 thus explained — "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart?" Here two things are obvious. First, what in the one sentence is said to be done by satan, is in the other ascribed to Ananias himself; and, second, what is meant by satan filling the heart, is explained to mean, Ananias conceiving this thing in his heart. It seems to be a Hebrew idiom, and is illustrated by the words of Ahasuerus to Esther the queen. "Who is he, and where is he that durst presume in his heart to do so?"

It is in the margin, "Whose heart hath filled him?" See Esth. 7: 5. Notice, further, it is not said Satan had filled the heart of Sapphira, verse 9. Peter only says to her, "How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the spirit of the Lord?" But why? for she lied as well as her husband. This is accounted for by considering that great or uncommon instances of natural or moral evil among the Jews were ascribed to Satan. Peter speaks, at the outset, of the greatness of the sin of lying to the Holy Spirit, in the popular language of the times; but he had also explained his meaning, or spoken according to the state of the case, by saying, "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart?" After this it would have been incongruous to introduce again the popular language about Satan in speaking to Sapphira. Peter's explanation of the popular language, "Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart?" agrees precisely with James' account of the origin of sin, 1: 13, 14. James does not allow any man to say, when he is tempted, that he is tempted of God; for God tempteth no man. But if it be true that Ananias was, or any man is tempted of Satan, would he not allow them to say the truth? But James expressly declares that every man is, tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust. Ananias and his wife were drawn away by their lust or love of money. This satan filled their heart, and they were enticed by it to lie to the Spirit of God. But had a fallen angel enticed them, why is he never blamed for it by those whom he seduced? Did David blame him? Did even Judas blame him? No, bad as he was, he takes all the blame to himself. "I have betrayed the innocent blood." Nor is Satan ever threatened with any punishment. Ananias and his wife are struck dead for their crime; but if Satan was the chief agent, why does he escape? For a very good reason: there never was such a being to be punished.

Acts 26: 18. "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God." The history of Paul's preaching does not afford

an instance that he ever purposed, or actually did turn a single individual from the power of a fallen angel, called the Devil or Satan. Had such a remarkable thing happened, it would have been noticed, and the person congratulated on account of his deliverance. He turned many from the power of the adversary; for it is said he turned away much people, saying they were no gods which were made with hands. Was there no satan or adversary but a fallen angel from which he could turn men? The persecuting Jews are called satan. Peter was called satan. And surely the whole system of ignorance and superstition, upheld by priests and civil rulers, was a satan or adversary. See this more fully shown on Eph. 6: 11, in the next Section. From this satan many were turned. See Acts of the Apostles. Comp. Col. 1: 13, where we read of men turned from "the power of darkness." Accordingly, some read the passage before us thus: "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, even from the power of satan unto God." The darkness of ignorance, superstition, and wickedness, were the satan from which Paul turned men, and this he did by the light of the glorious gospel of Christ.

Rom. 16: 20. "And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." It is not easily conceived how a fallen angel was bruised under the feet of Christians in the apostolic age. It does not accord with fact, and Satan is now believed to be as subtle, powerful, and active as ever. The term satan is frequently used to designate the persecuting Jews, and this declaration of the apostle is agreeable to the fact, for they were bruised under the feet of Christians in the destruction of their city and temple, and dispersed among all nations, as our Lord predicted, Matt. 24. At this period the disciples of Jesus had rest from their persecutions.

1 Cor. 5: 5. "To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." The term spirit

is often used in Scripture as equivalent to person, or for the person himself. Paul certainly did not mean this person's spirit separate from his body, for it does not appear that his punishment included such a separation; nor that it was to be punished to the end of the world and then saved, for he says nothing about the destruction or punishment of this spirit. Besides, the common belief is that unless persons' spirits are saved before death, they never can be saved after it. If Satan was a fallen angel, to whom this person was delivered, it is rather strange that such a being should be in any way the instrument of salvation. Besides, if the day of the Lord here means the end of this world, and spirit a part of man which exists separate from the body, why is the salvation of his spirit only mentioned? One should rather think that it would be the flesh that required salvation from the hands of Satan, for he was to destroy the flesh that the spirit might be saved. It is well known that the term satan signifies an adversary. It is often applied to the adversaries of Christians and Christianity. This person in the church at Corinth was guilty of incest. See verse 1. The apostle commanded them to deliver him over to this satan, or to put him away from among themselves, verse 13. This was to be done for the person's good, the destruction or punishment of the flesh, or to bring him to repentance, and that he might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. The first question that arises here is, what day of the Lord Jesus is meant? I answer, that day which our Lord had forewarned his disciples of, and in view of which he exhorted them to be found watchful and faithful. See Matt. 24. Well, what kind of salvation did the apostle mean, when he said, "that the spirit or person may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus?" I answer the same kind of salvation enjoyed by all those who endured to the end. Matt. 24: 13. This person was not believing to the salvation of his soul or person, but was drawing back to perdition. He was not looking for his Lord's coming, but was say-

ing, by his conduct, My Lord delayeth his coming. Such were the means prescribed for converting this sinner from the error of his way, and saving a soul or person from death, and hiding a multitude of sins. The means proved effectual, as is evident from 2 Cor. 2, where Paul commands the Corinthians to forgive him, and to confirm their love to him; and assigns as a reason why they should do so, "lest Satan should get an advantage of us; for we are not ignorant of his devices." What satan, pray? The very same satan, or the adversaries of the gospel, to whom this person was delivered for the destruction of the flesh.

1 Tim. 1: 20. "Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." The remarks on the last text are sufficient here.

1 Cor. 7: 5. "Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency." At Corinth, prostitution formed a part of the worship of the gods. To avoid fornication, the apostle commands that every man should have his own wife, and every woman her own husband, verse 2. But, if the one defrauded the other, the defrauded, in such a place as Corinth, was liable to be tempted by satan, or the adversaries of the gospel, to licentiousness. To guard them against bringing such a reproach on Christ's name, this injunction was delivered. Comp. verse 4, where their mutual rights are stated. But somewhat of a different view may be given of this passage in agreement with the scripture usage of the term satan. It sometimes designates lust or sinful desire, which might, if the one defrauded the other, prove a satan or adversary to tempt them to licentious indulgence.

2 Cor. 2: 11. "Lest Satan should get an advantage of us; for we are not ignorant of his devices." See on 1 Cor. 5: 5, above, for the meaning of this text. I

may just add, that the scripture usage of the term satan would warrant us to say that an unforgiving temper of mind was the satan here referred to. It is surely an adversary to a Christian, and gets an advantage over him if he indulges it.

2 Cor. 11 : 14. "And no marvel, for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." The whole context goes to show that the apostle is speaking of human beings. He speaks, 1st. Of satan, which simply means an adversary; and we think it indisputable that this term is applied both in the Old and New Testaments to the unbelieving and persecuting Jews. They were transformed into an angel of light, for their opposition was under the pretence of great zeal for God and the law. It is implied that in reality they were the angel of darkness, considered by Zoroaster the author and director of all evil. This was indeed the case with the Jews, for they were the authors and directors of all the opposition to Christians and Christianity, as the New Testament shows. 2d. The apostle also speaks of the "ministers" of this satan. No one, we think, can dispute that the apostle calls the false teachers in the church at Corinth the ministers of satan. They were transformed as ministers of righteousness, for under pretence of preaching the gospel they perverted it. See verses 3, 4, 12, 13, 15. They preached another gospel. See Gal. 1 : 6—10. Compare Acts 15 : 1, &c.; Gal. 5 : 1—7, and many other passages. They were in heart opposed to the gospel, and were in fact joined with the unbelieving Jews in opposing the truth and the apostles who preached it. They were the ministers or assistants of the Jews, who were the open and avowed adversaries of Christianity. If Satan was transformed into an angel of light, there was no cause to marvel that his ministers should transform themselves into the apostles of Christ, and as ministers of righteousness. The apostle says concerning them, "Whose end shall be according to their works." What end? The apostle tells us that their end "is

destruction." Phil. 3 : 18, 19. The same destruction which came on the unbelieving Jews, whose minister they were. See Phil. 1 : 28, 29 ; 1 Peter 4 : 17, 18. See particularly on Matt. 24, 25, and 2 Thess. 2, in the Second Part.

2 Cor. 12 : 7. "And lest I should be exalted above measure, through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure." The word which is here translated messenger is *angelos*, and which in other places is rendered angel. It was "the angel of Satan" that buffeted Paul. Dr. Kennicott says, Dissert. i., p. 100, "For the messenger of Satan means here a false teacher, in opposition to a true apostle, called 'the messenger of God.' Gal. 4 : 14." See Parkhurst on the word "Angelos," and on the last passage, for the satan here meant.

1 Thess. 2 : 18. "Wherefore we would have come unto you (even I, Paul) once and again, but Satan hindered us." Acts 17, 1 Thess. 3 : 1—9, with many other passages, show that the satan who hindered Paul from going to the Thessalonians was the persecuting Jews, who are frequently called satan. Nothing in Paul's history shows a fallen angel ever troubled him. Only render the term satan adversary, here and in other places, and such a being disappears.

2 Thess. 2 : 9. "Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders." The apostle simply says here, "whose coming is after the working of the adversary." If this is understood of the persecuting Jews, who are called satan in other texts, it is agreeable to the fact, for many came in Christ's name before the destruction of Jerusalem, pretending to work miracles, so that if it had been possible they would have deceived the very elect. See Matt. 24, and Whitby on 2 Thess. 2.

1 Tim. 5 : 15. "For some are already turned aside after Satan." What satan had they turned aside after?

The words which immediately precede show this: "I will, therefore, that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." The satan after whom they had turned aside was evidently the Jews, for they are called both satan and adversary in other texts, and they did speak reproachfully of Christians. It is not easily perceived how persons could turn aside after a fallen angel, but to apostatize from the faith, or go over to its adversaries, is easily understood.

Rev. 2: 9. "I know thy works, and tribulations, and poverty (but thou art rich), and I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan." Who a true Jew was Paul informs us, Rom. 2: 28, 29. The persons spoken of said they were Jews, but were not. They were of the synagogue of satan,—belonged to the synagogue of the unbelieving, persecuting Jews. Who ever supposed that a fallen angel had a synagogue, and that the persons John speaks of belonged to it? Nor can it be believed any number of men had a synagogue in those days which was called the "synagogue of Satan," or of a fallen angel. But the synagogue of the Jews, or the adversary, occasions no difficulty.

Rev. 3: 9. "Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee." See on the last passage a sufficient illustration of this text. I would only add, that it has been thought by some there is an allusion here to the subjection of Jews to the Christians in the flourishing state of Christianity.

Rev. 2: 13. "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is; and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth." If satan

here means a fallen angel, it must be admitted that his seat was at Pergamos in the days of John. But if satan is only rendered adversary, all difficulty is at once removed. Pergamos was a noted place for opposition to Christianity, for here Antipas suffered death, and Christ's disciples are highly commended for holding fast his name in such a place of persecution. It will not be easy to show how a wicked spirit had his seat or throne at Pergamos, and at the same time was walking about seeking whom he might devour.

Rev. 2 : 24. "But unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira (as many as have not this doctrine, and who have not known the depths of Satan, as they speak), I will put upon you none other burden." Here again it is only necessary to translate the word satan adversary, and all idea of a fallen angel disappears. The deep things, or depths of satan, are the depths of the adversary. It is said that the Gnostics called their mysteries the deep things of God and the deep things of Bythus. And Lowman calls it the deep arts of deceit and error. Paul says, "We are not ignorant of his devices," 2 Cor. 2: 11. And the whole conduct of the persecuting Jews is a comment on this passage and others above considered.

Such are all the places in the New Testament where the word satan occurs, and it is evident the Old and New Testament usage of it is similar, or rather the same. In neither does it designate a fallen angel, whom Christians call the Devil and Satan.

SECTION VI.

ALL THE PASSAGES WHERE THE ORIGINAL TERM DIABOLOS, TRANSLATED DEVIL, IS USED, CONSIDERED.

We have seen that the term satan means an adversary, and have noticed its various applications by the sacred writers. We are now to pay some attention to the meaning and application of the term (*diabolos*) devil, where it occurs in the New Testament.

Let it be then observed, in general, that the term devils is used in the following places in the Old Testament. "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring.—They sacrificed unto devils, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not.—And Jeroboam ordained him priests for the high places, and for the devils, and for the calves which he had made.—Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils." Lev. 17: 7; Deut. 32: 17; 2 Chron. 11: 15; Psalm 106: 37. The word rendered devils in this last text is *daimonion* in the Seventy's version, and also in the following places,—Psalm 96: 5, and 91: 6; Isai. 65: 10, 34: 14, and 13: 21. It is evident these devils, or demons, were only heathen idols, or Pagan deities, which could neither do good nor evil to man. They were made, and some of them were styled new gods, which had come newly up, and which were not formerly known by the Jews or their fathers. To these demons, or gods, the Jews sacrificed their sons and daughters. But they were altogether different from what is meant by the Devil or Satan; for, as Dr. Campbell observes, "They could no more be said to have worshipped the Devil, as we Christians understand the term, than they could be said to have worshipped the cannibals of New Zealand,

because they had no more conception of the one than of the other."—Dissert. vi. He adds, "As to the worship of the Devil, *tou diabolous*, nothing can be clearer than that in Scripture no Pagans are charged with it." The fact is, the Jews knew nothing about the Devil until they went to Babylon. Dr. Campbell says, "The word *diabolos*, in its ordinary acceptation, signifies calumniator, traducer, false accuser, from the verb *diaballein*, to calumniate." This is also its meaning, as given by Parkhurst and other lexicographers. Its extraordinary acceptation with them and others is, it designates a fallen angel, who is the implacable enemy of God and man. But the first three passages which I shall quote show that our translators understood the word *diabolos* in the way Dr. Campbell explains it, which, he says, is its ordinary acceptation. The first is

1 Tim. 3 : 11. "Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers (*diabolous*), sober, faithful in all things." Here pious women are exhorted not to be slanderers—literally, "not to be devils." The very same word is used, verses 6, 7, in the singular number, and is rendered devil. Again, it is said, Titus 2 : 3, "The aged women, likewise, that they be in behavior as becometh holiness, not false accusers" (*diabolous*). Aged, pious women are exhorted not to be devils! Again, 2 Tim. 3 : 3, speaking of those who in the last days should have a form of godliness, but denying the power of it, they are said to be "without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers" (*diaboloi*)—literally, devils. Suffer me now to ask, why in these texts the word was not rendered devils? The reason is obvious; it would appear very strange to our ears to exhort Christian women not to be devils, for we have associated the idea of a fallen angel with this word, as we have with the term satan. It would have been a similar impropriety had the angel of the Lord, David and others, been called satan. But to avoid this, satan is rendered adversary in the Old Testament, and, in the above texts, the term

diabolos is rendered slanderer and false accuser. These texts, however, show us both how it was understood by the apostle and also by our translators.

John 6 : 70. "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" Dr. Campbell renders the term *diabolos* here spy, and Newcome and Wakefield render it accuser. This is in agreement with the preceding texts, and further remark is unnecessary.

John 13 : 2. "And supper being ended (the Devil having now put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's son, to betray him)." See on Luke 22 : 3, and John 13 : 27, in the last Section. What is said to be done by Satan in one is said to be done by the Devil in the other. Suffer me here to ask, When one man betrays another in our day, is the plea sustained in court, or anywhere else, that the Devil urged him to it? And would any man hang himself, if he believed he was the tool of such a powerful and malicious being? Judas' crime is wholly imputed to himself, Acts 1 : 17, 18. And every man is conscious when he sins that he did not need the assistance of such a being. The Scriptures, in plain language, refer sin to ourselves, and not to the Devil. See James 1 : 14, and Mark 7 : 21, 22.

1 Peter 5 : 8, 9. "Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary, the Devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about seeking whom he may devour; whom resist, steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world." As this is one of the principal texts quoted in proof of the existence of the Devil, I shall consider it particularly. We have, then, 1st. An exhortation, "Be sober, be vigilant." This was addressed to Christians scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, &c., chap. 1 : 1. It is so plain that they were suffering persecution from the enemies of the gospel, that it would be loss of time to give any proof of it. 2d. We have next the reason assigned why this exhortation should be obeyed. Why be sober and vigilant? "Because your adversary, the Devil, as a

roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." It is confidently believed, by many good people, that this Devil, who walketh about like a roaring lion, is a fallen angel, or malignant spirit. But I ask, How is such a belief to be reconciled with his having his abode in hell, with some in the air, and others his tempting men in all parts of the earth at the same time? Such a belief is contrary to all facts and experience. Did ever any person see the Devil in the shape of a lion, hear him roar, or is an instance on record in the history of mankind of one being devoured by him? Such idle, childish stories have been told of the Devil, but what man in our day gives the least credit to them? I find human beings are frequently compared to lions,—Num. 23 : 24, 24 : 8, 9; Jer. 50 : 17; 2 Tim. 4 : 17; also to roaring lions, Psal. 22 : 13; Prov. 19 : 12, 20 : 2; Jer. 2 : 15; Isai. 5 : 29. They are also compared to a devouring lion, Psalm 17 : 12, 22 : 21; Jer. 2 : 30, 4 : 7; Ezek. 19 : 1—6, 22 : 25. On examination I also find that God is compared to a lion and a roaring lion, Isai. 31 : 4; Hosea 11 : 10, 13 : 7, 8; Amos 3 : 4—8. Not one instance can I find where the Devil, a fallen angel, is compared to a lion. If he is so in this passage, it is a solitary instance, which is presumptive evidence that this was not the apostle's meaning. Who, then, was this roaring lion? Peter answers by saying, "your adversary the Devil." The word here rendered adversary is *antidikos*. It only occurs in this and the following texts in the New Testament, Matt. 5 : 25; Luke 12 : 58, 18 : 3. Parkhurst says it means "an adversary or opponent in a law-suit," and quotes Herodian in proof of it. The text under consideration is the only one in which he considers this word to mean a fallen angel, or the Devil. He desires us to compare Rev. 12 : 10; Job 1 : 9, 2 : 3; and Zech. 3 : 1, in proof that *antidikos* in this text means such a wicked spirit. It is very plain that he considered adversary and devil to mean the same thing. To say that the word devil, or the word adver-

sary here used as its explanation, refers to a fallen angel, is taking for granted the very question at issue. Who, then, was this adversary, who went about like a roaring lion? By recurring to the New Testament usage of *antikeimai*, also rendered adversary, we shall see this.

1st. It is rendered adversary, and applied to men who were the adversaries of Christ and of Christianity, particularly the persecuting Jews. Thus, when our Lord had refuted the Jews who had found fault with him for healing a person on their Sabbath, it is said, "all his adversaries were ashamed," Luke 13 : 17. He also said to his disciples, "I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist," Luke 21 : 15. Again, Paul says, 1 Cor. 16 : 9, "For a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries." And, Philip. 1 : 28, he says, "And in nothing terrified by your adversaries: which is to them an evident token of perdition." And, in 1 Tim. 5 : 14, he exhorteth young women to conduct themselves so as to give "none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully." In all these texts the adversaries of the gospel, particularly the Jews, are referred to by the term adversary.

2d. It is rendered by the words opposeth and contrary, and applied to the following things. To the man of sin. "Who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God," 2 Thess. 2 : 4. To the opposition between flesh and spirit. "For the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other," Gal. 5 : 17. And, in 1 Tim. 1 : 10, it is used to express whatever is opposed to the truth. "And if there be any other thing that is contrary, or an adversary to sound doctrine." It is then beyond all fair debate that *antikeimai*, adversary, is not once used in reference to the Devil or Satan, though most people say he is the greatest adversary of both God and man. The fact is certain from the above texts, and the whole New Testament is proof that the opposing Jews

were the adversary of Christians and the chief cause of all their persecutions. They were the devil, the slanderer, or false accuser, who went about as a roaring lion seeking whom he might devour. See Acts 17, and indeed all the New Testament. It is also evident that the lusts and evil passions of men are termed adversary in several texts. And why are they termed so? I answer, because it is this devil or adversary within men, which makes them devils or adversaries in their conduct. I may add, the term satan we have seen signifies an adversary, and devil and satan are used synonymously in the New Testament, and both terms are used to express opposing persons and opposing things. That person or thing is a devil, satan, or adversary to another which is opposed to it. The unbelieving, persecuting Jews are in Scripture compared to a lion. Thus, Paul says, 2 Tim. 4: 16, 17, "At my first answer no man stood with me, but all men forsook me: I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge. Notwithstanding, the Lord stood with me and strengthened me; that by me the preaching might be fully known, and that all the Gentiles might hear; and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion." It is thought by some, that, by the lion, Paul referred to Nero or his prefect Helius Cesarianus, to whom he committed the government in his absence, with power to put to death whom he pleased. The reason given for this application of lion to Nero is, that Marsyas said to Agrippa when Tiberias died, "The lion is dead." Whether Paul ever heard this saying is uncertain, and if he had, we doubt whether his wisdom and prudence, in his then critical circumstances, would have allowed him to make such an allusion. What leads me to conclude that Paul, by the lion, referred to his persecutors the Jews, are the following things:

1st. They actually went about like a lion to devour him, and at the time he wrote he was in bonds from their persecutions. Neither Nero nor any other Roman magistrate sought after Paul, until stirred up by the

Jews. He was even obliged to appeal to Cæsar to be delivered from their hands.

2d. In Psalm 22: 13, 21, where Christ and his enemies are spoken of, the persecuting Jews are expressly compared to a roaring lion. If Paul compared them to this, he had the example of David for it. To this Psalm probably Paul alluded in the passage before us.

3d. To understand that the apostle, by the lion, refers to the persecuting Jews, renders its usage uniform in the New Testament; but to understand by it a fallen angel, is at variance with its entire usage throughout the Bible. It is agreeable to the fact that the Jews went about as a roaring lion, but it is contrary to all facts and experience, that a fallen angel ever did this. But Peter adds, "whom resist, steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world." The "afflictions" of Christians in the apostolic age arose from the persecuting Jews. Compare verse 10, and various other parts of the Epistle. But was a fallen angel in various places at the same time afflicting them? Besides, how could they resist steadfast in the faith an invisible spirit? It was with wicked men they had to contend, and from whom they suffered. See 1 Peter 4: 12; 1: 7. The word devil, we have seen, signifies a slanderer or false accuser. Peter then says, in this passage, "Your adversary the slanderer or false accuser goeth about as a roaring lion." That this referred to men, no one, we think, can doubt who reads chap. 2; 12, 15, 20; 3: 15—17, and 4: 4, of this epistle. Nor will any one dispute, that the words *o' antidikos, 'umon diabolos*, may be rendered thus: "the adversary your false accuser," or, "your adversary the false accuser." The whole epistle is a comment on this view of the passage, nor would any one have ever thought of a fallen angel, had the word *diabolos* been rendered false accuser, as it is in some other places. Common sense, and common scripture usage of words, lead to no other interpretation.

It should be remembered Peter was a Jew, and was familiar with the Jewish use of the terms satan and devil. Jesus had called him satan, and Judas a devil; and could there be any impropriety in calling the persecutors of Christians "your adversary, the devil"? Their ferocious cruelty made them as a roaring lion, walking about, seeking whom they might devour.

It is objected to this view of the passage, "The persecutors of Christians in Peter's day were many, but here he speaks of them as one." This objection has no force, for it is well known that in Scripture the singular is frequently put for the plural, and the reverse. Besides, all know that when many are spoken of collectively they are considered as one, and especially when they act in unison. The persecutors of Christians were many, but never did many act more in unison than they did in opposing Christians and Christianity. It is further objected, "Peter speaks emphatically of the Devil, as if he was a real being; for he calls him the Devil." Answer; the word *diabolos* here is without the article; therefore this objection is without force. Even if it had been used, the objection would derive little or no force from it, for it was very natural and proper for Peter to speak of the persecutors of Christians in this emphatic manner.

John 8 : 44. "Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it." If the Devil was the father of the unbelieving Jews whom our Lord here addressed, it is plain they were his sons or children. The question then is, what devil was their father? Professor Stuart shall inform us. In his letters to Dr. Miller, pp. 95—99, he thus writes:

"The word son was a favorite one among the Hebrews; and was employed by them to designate a great variety of relations. The son of anything, according to oriental idioms, may be either what is closely connected with

it, dependent on it, like it, the consequence of it, worthy of it, &c. But this view of the subject must be explained by actual examples from the Scriptures. The following I have selected from the Old and New Testaments.

"The son of eight days, that is, the child that is eight days old; the son of one hundred years, that is, the person who is one hundred years of age; the son of a year, that is, a yearling; the son of my sorrow, that is, one who has caused me distress; the son of my right hand, that is, one who will assist or be a help to me; son of old age, that is, begotten in old age; son of valor, that is, bold, brave; son of Belial [lit., son of good-for-nothing], that is, a worthless man; son of wickedness, that is, wicked; son of a murderer, that is, a murderous person; son of my vows, that is, son that answers to my vows; son of death, that is, one who deserves death; son of perdition, that is, one who deserves perdition; son of smiting, that is, one who deserves stripes; son of Gehenna, that is, one who deserves Gehenna; son of consolation, that is, one fitted to administer consolation; son of thunder, that is, a man of powerful, energetic eloquence or strength; son of peace, that is, a peaceable man; son of the morning, that is, morning star; son of the burning coal, that is, sparks of fire; son of the bow, that is, an arrow; son of the threshing-floor, that is, grain; son of oil, that is, fat; son of the house, that is, a domestic or slave; son of man, that is, man, as it is usually applied; but perhaps in a sense somewhat diverse, in several respects, as applied to the Saviour.

"Every kind of relation or resemblance whether real or imaginary, every kind of connection, is characterized by calling it the son of that thing to which it stands thus related, or with which it is connected."

The Professor adds, "It will be remembered, however, that when we investigate the meaning of the phrase son of the devil, in the Scriptures, we are investigating the *usus loquendi* of a Shemitish dialect. This will of course be conceded, in regard to the phrase in the Old

Testament; and I may add, that all critics are now agreed that although the words of the New Testament are Greek, the idiom is Hebrew." Mr. Stuart then tells us that "the son of anything, according to oriental idiom, may be either what is closely connected with it, dependent on it, like it, the consequence of it, worthy of it, &c." He adds, "Every kind of relation or resemblance, whether real or imaginary, every kind of connection is characterized by calling it the son of that thing to which it stands thus related, or with which it is connected." It is a plain case, then, that if the Jews were of their father the devil, or sons of the devil, and if the term devil means a slanderer, our Lord only told them that they were "slanderous persons." Were they not closely connected with slander, dependent on it, like it, and worthy of it? Mr. Stuart, by the above remarks, forever settles the question, that neither here nor anywhere else son of the devil refers to a fallen angel. — I might here close my remarks, but I shall briefly notice what is further said in the passage, that we may see how it agrees with the view which he has given us. It is then said, "and the lusts of your father ye will do." Well, did not the Jews slander the Saviour? They certainly did. But it is said, "He was a murderer from the beginning." We have seen, from the above quotation, that "son of wickedness" simply means "wicked;" and that "son of a murderer" signifies "a murderous person." That the Jews were murderous persons no one disputes. But, it will be said, how were the Jews murderous persons from the beginning of the world? This is not said. They are only said to have been "murderers from the beginning." The term *arhes*, here rendered the beginning, is used to express, the beginning of our Lord's ministry and miracles, John 8: 25; 6: 64; 15: 27; 16: 4; and 2: 11; 1 John 1: 1; 2: 7, 13, 14, 24; and 3: 11; 2d Epistle, verses 5, 6. In short, it is used to express the beginning of persons and things in a variety of ways. See Rev. 1: 8; 3: 14; 21: 6; and 22: 13;

Mark 1 : 1; Philip. 4 : 15; Heb. 2 : 3; Luke 1 : 2; 2 Thess. 2 : 13; Acts 11 : 15; Heb. 7 : 3; Acts 26 : 5; Matt. 24 : 8; Mark 13 : 8; Heb. 3 : 14; Col. 1 : 18. In the following places it refers to the beginning of the world — Heb. 1 : 10; Matt. 19 : 4, 8, and 24 : 21; Mark 10 : 6; 2 Peter 3 : 4. But let the reader notice that in these texts some additional phrase or circumstance is introduced, showing that the beginning of the world is meant. We are not left to infer this merely from the term "beginning."

Such are all the places where this word is to be found, except John 1 : 1, where it is said, "In the beginning was the Word." This forms no particular exception to its general usage. See the Unitarian and Trinitarian controversy respecting this text. The only other text which can be deemed an exception is 1 John 3 : 8, which will be considered immediately. But it is not necessary to confine its sense to the beginning of the Gospel dispensation, for the very same devil the Jews were of had been from the beginning of the world, had deceived Eve, and led Cain to murder his brother Abel. The Jews had been "murderous persons" from the beginning of the Gospel dispensation. From our Lord's birth to his death they sought to slay him. In verses 37, 40, he accused the Jews of seeking to kill him, and this they did because his word had no place in them, verse 37; they abode not in the truth — there was no truth in them. They were of their father the Devil. What this was is explained verse 23. "Ye are from beneath; ye are of this world." "And whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin," verse 34. And, chap. 3 : 31, our Lord told them, "He that is of the earth is earthy and speaketh of the earth." What was it then to be from beneath, of this world, and earthy? Was it not to judge after the flesh, or from their earthly corrupt principles and lusts? — verse 15. If the Jews had abode in the truth, or Christ's word had been in them, they would not have been murderous persons, or made God's

law void through their traditions. Had they believed Moses, they would have believed in Jesus, for he wrote of him. John 5 : 45—47. Perhaps it will be said, Are not the Jews expressly distinguished from the Devil, who is called their father? Son and father must, in this case, be the same. Professor Stuart informs us above, and I think correctly, that "son of a murderer" is simply a Hebrew idiom for "a murderous person." The Jews were so, and they spoke a lie, and were the fathers of it. What lie did they speak? They said, verses 39, 40, "Abraham is our father." They lied; for, says our Lord to them, "If ye were Abraham's children ye would do the works of Abraham. But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham." He adds, verse 41, "Ye do the deeds of your father." What father? What they had seen or learned from their own evil lusts and passions; and this accords with the source from which all evil proceeds, stated by James, chap. 1 : 14, 15.

We have seen that the principle of evil was not only personified but deified. In this passage and others it is spoken of as a person or being. Eve's lust said to her, "Ye shall not surely die;" which was a lie. It is, in the passage before us, represented as the father of lies, and the lusts or desires of this father the Jews did. Lust from the beginning abode not in the truth, for it was by lust conceiving contrary to the commandment the first deviation from truth was made, and the first lie told; and when lust said "Ye shall not surely die," it was not only a liar, but the father of it. From our mother Eve to the present day, all men who listen to the lies of their own lusts, contrary to God's commandments, have found that the ways of transgressors are hard. Men, obeying the voice of their lusts, murder themselves, are led to murder others, and have turned the world into a Golgotha. But while lust is the true cause

of all the mischief, an imaginary being has been invented and believed in to bear the blame of it.

In concluding these remarks, I would ask every candid man, did our Lord mean to tell the Jews that they were of their father, a fallen angel, and that the lusts of this fallen angel they would do? And did he mean that this fallen angel was a murderer from the beginning? That this wicked being abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him? And that "When he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar, and the father of it?" Yes, all this is confidently asserted to be our Lord's meaning. But why should it be believed, until it is first proved, that an angel fell from heaven and became a devil? The belief of this is premature, until it is shown that such a being really exists. To say he was a murderer from the beginning of the world, and refer to Gen. 3, will not do, for we have seen that the serpent that deceived Eve was not a fallen angel; nor is such a being once mentioned in the Old Testament. Nor will it answer any better to refer to Cain's murder of Abel, for not a single hint is dropped that the Devil, or a fallen angel, had any concern with it. Besides, when the Scriptures trace crimes to their source, in plain language, they never refer them to the Devil, but to lust within men. See James 4 : 1—16, and 1 : 13—16; Matt. 15 : 18—21.

1 John 3 : 8, 9, 10. "He that committeth sin is of the Devil; for the Devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him; and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the Devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." This and the preceding passage were written by the same person. The language and sentiments of both are similar, and the quotations and remarks made are appli-

cable to both. We shall add some brief remarks here. John says, "He that committeth sin is of the Devil." He was writing to Christians, who were the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, and could not say to them, as he did to the unbelieving Jews, "Ye are of your father the Devil." It appears from verse 7 that he said this to guard them against sin. Comp. John 8 : 34 and Rom. 6 : 10—23. "For the Devil sinneth from the beginning." This corresponds to John 8 : 44. "He was a murderer from the beginning." What devil sinned or was a murderer from the beginning? Answer; at verse 15 it is said, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer;" and at verse 12, "Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother." Cain, like the Jews, was of his father the Devil, and the lusts of his father he did. But no man will assert that Moses intimates a fallen angel influenced Cain to slay Abel. If he that hateth his brother is a murderer, Cain was one before he slew Abel. It was from this hatred in his heart the bloody deed proceeded, and which, in the eye of both God and man, constitutes murder. Well, the very first time satan is mentioned in Scripture the term is applied to a well, and the explanation given us in the margin is hatred. See Sect. III. Besides, in Sect. II. it has been shown that Eve's lust or desire, when it had conceived, brought forth sin; and this devil sinned from the beginning. It came to be personified, yea, was deified, as we have seen in Sections III., IV.; is called Satan in the book of Job, and Devil and Satan in other parts of Scripture. This view is agreeable to the passage, for it is said, "He that committeth sin is of the Devil." It is added, "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil." What, then, were the works of the Devil?

1st. All agree that sin is the work of the Devil. What, then, produces sin? James says, chap. 1 : 15, "Then lust, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth sin."

Is it not plain that lust is the Devil? Compare Mark 7 : 21, 22.

2d. Death is also the work of the Devil. Death entered by sin, and sin entered by lust conceiving and bringing it forth; and when sin is finished it bringeth forth death. The wages of sin is death, see Rom. 5 : 12, and 6 : 23.

Was the Son of God manifested then to destroy sin? This is expressly declared, verse 5: "And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin." We think that "to take away our sins," in this verse, is the same as to destroy the works of the Devil, in the passage before us; and in both Christ is said to be manifested to do this. Yea, through death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil. See on Heb. 2 : 14, below. Does the Son of God by his manifestation destroy death? Nothing can be more explicitly stated than this. "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O, death! I will be thy plagues; O, grave! I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes." Hos. 13 : 14. See 1 Cor. 15 : 53—58. In verse 26 it is expressly declared, "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." Suffer me now to ask, Is it anywhere said Christ was manifested to destroy a fallen angel? This I think no man will affirm. Why, then, is it so confidently affirmed that the Devil is a fallen angel?

Heb. 2 : 14, 15. "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil; and deliver them, who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." Supposing we admit for a moment the existence of such a being as the Devil, what follows from this passage? It follows that he is to be destroyed, for it is expressly said, Christ died that "through death he might destroy him that had

the power of death, that is, the Devil." But do our orthodox friends allow that he is to be destroyed through the death of Jesus Christ? No; they aver that he is to exist forever, the enemy of God and the tormentor of men. But if this text teaches his existence, it as certainly teaches his destruction. I urge, then, the belief of both, or the rejection of both doctrines. But this is not all, for if this text teaches the Devil to be a fallen angel, it as explicitly declares that he has the power of death. By the power of death is generally understood power to produce death, and retain men in this state when dead. But is it not a very extraordinary supposition that such a wicked being should have such a power? Besides, is it not contrary to other parts of Scripture, where God says, "I kill, and I make alive; I bring down to the grave, and also bring up again"? Can any one think God has delegated this power to the Devil? By taking into view other parts of Scripture, we find death ascribed to a very different cause than the power of a fallen angel. Rom. 5: 12, and in chap. 6: 23, we are told that the wages of sin is death; but not a word is said as if the Devil had any concern with it. James, chap. 1: 15, also says that when "sin is finished it bringeth forth death," but says not a word about the Devil having any power to produce it or continue it. Nor does the apostle say the sting of death is the Devil, but the sting of death is sin. Besides, when speaking of the victory obtained by Jesus Christ over death, the apostle does not say, "O, Devil! where is thy power over death?" but says, "O, death! where is thy sting? O, grave! where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." The apostle here renders thanks to God for victory over sin, and the law, which is the strength of sin, and also over death; but renders no thanks to God through Jesus Christ for victory over a fallen angel or the Devil. Can any candid man then think, that, if

such a being had power over death, that Paul, in giving thanks to God, would have omitted thanking him for victory over this malignant, wicked being, who had so long and universally exercised it? We should rather think, had Paul believed this, victory over the Devil would have been one of the principal things he would have mentioned.

What, then, it may be asked, is the devil referred to in this passage? I answer, whatever has the power of death. What, then, has the power of death? I answer, sin, and the law, the strength of sin; by which death came first to be introduced, and by which it hath passed through to all the human race. See Rom. 5: 12, 13. The judgment, Gen. 3: 19, was by one to condemnation. Death reigned by one man's offence, and no power of man has been able to resist his universal sway; and but for the death of Christ, and his resurrection from the dead, no hope of a resurrection could ever be entertained.

But let us examine the passage itself a little more particularly. "Forasmuch, then, as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." Well, for what purpose did he take part in flesh and blood? "That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil." We have shown, on 1 John 3: 8, what the works of the Devil are, and that Christ was manifested to destroy them. But here Christ is said to destroy the Devil himself. What devil was it then which produced such works? Such is the workmanship, but what devil was the workman? James tells us in plain words, "Then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." Christ by his death would accomplish very little to the purpose to destroy a fallen angel, or even to destroy sin and death, if lust which bringeth forth sin was not destroyed. It would only be like lopping off the branches from a poisonous tree, while the stock from which they all

sprung was allowed to remain. But Christ, by his death, is not only to destroy sin and death, the works of the Devil, but lust, or the Devil. He is not only to destroy the workmanship but the workman, not merely the branches but the root, not only the streams of sin and death but the fountains from which they flow. He is to destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil. See Col. 1 : 20; Eph. 1 : 10; 1 Cor. 15. But it ought further to be noticed, that "the strength of sin is the law." It is this which makes sin to be what it is, for sin is the transgression of the law, and where there is no law there is no transgression. The law has always said, "The soul that sinneth shall die." The law of Moses entered that the offence might abound. It gendered to bondage, and was the ministration of death. 2 Cor. 3 : 7. Comp. Rom. 5 : 20, 21; Gal. 4 : 24. It could not give life, but cursed every one who did not continue in all things written in the book of the law to do them. Gal. 3 : 21, 10. Well, did Christ through death abolish the law? The word which is in this passage rendered destroy, Parkhurst says, means "to render ineffectual, abolish, annul, destroy." It is the same word which, in 2 Cor. 3 : 7, is rendered done away, and applied to the law of Moses, which was done away in Christ; and is rendered abolished, Eph. 2 : 15, when speaking of this very law. It is also rendered abolished, 2 Tim. 1 : 10, where it is said of Christ, "Who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." This, then, is agreeable to the fact. Christ, through death, destroyed or abolished the law, which was the strength of sin, and denounced death on the transgressor. It had the power of death, and might with as much propriety be called the devil or accuser as the writing (Ezra 4 : 6) was called a satan or adversary to the Jews. The law is expressly said to have been the accuser of the Jews, John 5 : 45—47.

But it is added, "And deliver them who, through

fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage." The Jews were kept in bondage under the law. But Christ delivers from this bondage, Rom. 8 : 15, 5 : 1, 8 : 1, and 8 : 14. Whoever believes in Christ is delivered not only from the law, which is the strength of sin, but is led to crucify his flesh with its affections and lusts. And he is delivered from the fear of death, by the knowledge of life and immortality brought to light by the gospel. Indeed, the ultimate end of the death of Christ is to bring men to a state of incorruption and glory. See 1 Cor. 15.

Acts 13 : 10. "O! full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the Devil, thou enemy of all righteousness! wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" The quotation from Professor Stuart, on John 8 : 44, above, equally illustrates this passage. The term devil signifies a slanderer. Child of a slanderer, according to Mr. Stuart, signifies "a slanderous person," as son of a murderer means "a murderous person." In fact, Paul, verse 8, gives in substance this very explanation. "Elymas, the sorcerer, withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith." Being full of all subtilty and mischief, he was a satan or devil in opposing and slandering the faith of Christ.

Matt. 13 : 39. "The enemy that sowed them is the Devil." The whole of this context is considered in the Second Part, to which the reader is referred. See Mr. Stuart's remarks, quoted above, on John 8 : 44. The question then is, did a fallen angel mix those wicked children with the children of the kingdom? This must be affirmed by those who say that the Devil is a fallen angel. But, though this is asserted, we have never seen any proof of it, nor will it be easily explained how such a being could do this. Besides, we do not perceive what need there was for the services of such a being to produce such a crop. What, then, is meant by the devil that sowed the tares? In the Second Part we have shown that the tares were the unbelieving Jews, who, at

the end of the world or age, were destroyed. Well, what devil sowed them? The same devil or satan who put it into the heart of Judas to betray Jesus. No other devil was required to produce a crop of tares, or wicked men, but the evil principles of their own hearts, for they were of their father the Devil, and the lusts of their father they did. See on John 8 : 44, above.

Matt. 25 : 41. "Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels." This passage must be noticed in the Second Part, in considering Matt., chaps. 24, 25. Here I shall only notice the following things. 1st. It has been proved, we think beyond all controversy, that the unbelieving, persecuting Jews are repeatedly called the devil and satan. 2d. It has also been proved that the angels or messengers of this satan were the false teachers, or those who joined with the persecuting Jews in opposing the gospel and persecuting those who preached it. See on 2 Cor. 11 : 14, and 12 : 7, in Section V. See, also, the next Section. As this will not be disputed, let us, 3d. Notice the everlasting fire which is here said to be prepared for the Devil and his angels. This everlasting fire is not said to have been prepared for those whom our Lord is represented as addressing thus, "Depart from me, ye cursed." No; it is said to have been prepared for the persecuting Jews and their angels or messengers. What, then, was this everlasting fire? In my inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, Tartarus and Gehenna, Chap. II., Sect. III., the following things have been shown at length, to which I refer the reader. It has been shown that fire is a figure used in Scripture to express the temporal judgments of God which came on the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple; that punishment which they have been suffering for nearly two thousand years, and are still enduring. It has also been shown that the phrase "everlasting fire" is used as an equivalent expression for "hell fire." All these,

and other things connected with this subject, have been shown there, and need not be repeated here. See on this also 2 Thess. chap. 1, considered in the Second Part of this work. 4th. To whom did our Lord refer when he said, "Depart from me, ye cursed," into everlasting fire? The answer to this question will be given in considering Matt. chaps. 24, 25, in the Second Part, referred to, which to avoid repetition we shall omit here.

Acts 10: 38. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil: for God was with him." Our Lord healed those who were possessed with demons, and cast them out; but it is nowhere said that he cast out *diaboloi*, devils; and this is the only place where he is said to have healed those who were oppressed of the Devil. In curing persons he often commanded the demons to depart from them, yet on no occasion does he ever speak to *diabolos*, the Devil, and command him to depart. His temptation in the wilderness may be thought an exception to this remark, which will be considered in its place. If the Devil, a fallen angel, inflicted bodily diseases in those days, we can see no good reason why he should not in these, for few think his power is contracted or his malice abated by the lapse of seventeen centuries. But who, in our day, ascribes diseases to the Devil? If it is done, it is merely in compliance with a popular mode of speaking. The question will, then, be asked, What devil were those persons oppressed with, for is said our Lord healed all who were oppressed of the Devil? In answer to this, let it be observed that Peter is here evidently speaking of our Lord's kindness in healing men of diseases generally, whatever they were. They are spoken of in the aggregate, and are called being "oppressed of the Devil." This is in perfect agreement with what has been stated Sections III. and IV. that Satan, the Devil, or Ahraman, was the author of all evil, just as much as the good god, Yazdan, was the author of all good. That the Jews had

imbibed such an opinion, and used language in accordance with it, has been shown. Ascribing all diseases here to the oppression of the Devil, shows that Peter spoke in accordance with this popular opinion. This our Lord did, in saying, that Satan had bound a woman eighteen years with an infirmity. Satan is also said to have afflicted Job; but it has been shown that this very account is introduced for the purpose of refuting such an opinion, and establishing that God is the author of afflictions as well as of prosperity.

Eph. 4: 27. "Neither give place to the Devil." In the preceding verse, the apostle exhorts, "Be ye angry, and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath." He immediately adds, "Neither give place to the Devil." What devil? Evidently wrath; for, by letting the sun go down upon their wrath, they gave place to this devil; or, it gave occasion to the enemies of the gospel to speak reproachfully. It is not easy to understand how by anger they gave place to a fallen angel. Besides, men's wrathful passions are ascribed to themselves in Scripture. See James 4: 1—6.

Eph. 6: 11. "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil." See the whole context. See, also, all the other texts where the enemies of Christianity are called the devil and satan. What in this verse is called collectively the devil, is thus particularized, verse 12: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood," or, we wrestle not merely with men. For this sense of the phrase flesh and blood, see the following among other texts—Matt. 16: 17; 1 Cor. 15: 50; Gal. 1: 16; Heb. 2: 14. "But against principalities," or supreme governors. For this sense of the word principalities, see Rom. 8: 38; Tit. 3: 1. "Against powers," or, against magistrates clothed with authority. See, for this sense of the word powers, Rom. 13: 1—3. It seems to include supreme rulers both civil and ecclesiastical. See Luke 12: 11; Col. 1: 16; Eph. 1: 21; Col. 2: 10; Luke 20: 20. "Against the

rulers of the darkness of this world." Wakefield renders the passage thus: "Clothe yourselves in the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the devices of the accuser. For we not only have to wrestle against flesh and blood, but against authority, against the powers, against the rulers of this dark age; against the wickedness of spiritual men in a heavenly dispensation." In his note he says, "viz., against Jewish governors, who have a dispensation of religion from heaven, as well as against heathen magistrates, under the darkness of superstition and idolatry." By the rulers of the darkness of this world, Doddridge understands the "heathen rulers; and by flesh and blood the lower ranks of mankind." These remarks are a sufficient illustration of this passage. If it is asked, What darkness did the apostle refer to? I answer, the ignorance, superstition and wickedness, which abounded both among the Jews and Gentiles. Comp. Luke 22: 53, Col. 1: 13. It is well known that principalities and powers, both civil and ecclesiastical, Jewish and heathen, were opposed to the gospel. They were the rulers of this darkness, and the people were often excited against Christianity by the prevailing ignorance and popular superstitions. See Acts 19. For the scripture usage of the words spiritual and high or heavenly places, compare Rom. 15: 27; 1 Cor. 9: 11; 1 Peter 2: 5; Col. 3: 16; John 3: 12; Eph. 1: 20, and 3: 10. A phrase, the reverse of the entire expression, "spiritual wickedness in high places," occurs Eph. 1: 3, and assists in explaining it. But, let any one go over this passage, and see if he can give anything like a rational interpretation of it, on the supposition that the devil referred to was a fallen angel?

1 Tim. 3: 6, 7. "Not a novice, lest, being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the Devil. Moreover, he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the Devil." What devil does the apostle refer to? In answer to this, let us hear the following writers. Wake-

field renders the passage thus: "No novice; lest he be puffed up, and so fall into flame from the accuser. He ought, also, to have good testimony from without; lest he fall into reproach, and a snare of the accuser." See a similar rendering in the Improved Version. M'Knight, on this passage, says, "According to Erasmus, this clause should be translated, 'fall into the condemnation of the accuser,'—a sense which the word *diabolos* hath, verse 11. For he supposes that by the accuser is meant the persecuting Jews and Gentiles, who were ready to condemn the Christians for every misdemeanor." See remarks on the next passage.

2 Tim. 2: 24, 25, 26. "And the servant of the Lord must not strive; but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient. In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves; if God, peradventure, will give them repentance, to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the Devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." The principal question to be considered here is, What is the snare of the devil? In the preceding text, some were in danger of falling into it, and here we read of some being in it, and needing to be recovered out of it. They are described as persons who have not repented, who have not acknowledged the truth, but are opposing themselves to it. The servant of the Lord, in attempting their recovery, must not strive, but be gentle unto all men. He must be apt to teach; he must be patient; and in meekness he must instruct those in the snare of the devil, or those who oppose themselves, who have not repented and acknowledged the truth. It seems, then, that both from the situation of those persons, and, also, the way in which they are delivered, the snare of the devil is their opposition to the gospel, and the various ways and means by which its enemies prevented men from believing it. M'Knight says, "The snare of the devil, out of which the opposers of the gospel are to be taken alive by the servant of the Lord, signifies those preju-

dices, and errors, and habits of sensuality, which hindered both Jews and Gentiles in the first age from attending to the evidences of the gospel." In this view the snare of the devil is stated, Col. 1: 13, Rom. 6: 17, and their recovery out of it, Acts 26: 18, and many other similar passages.

James 4: 7. "Submit yourselves, therefore, to God. Resist the Devil, and he will flee from you." The preceding verses point out this devil to be envy and pride, or their evil lusts and passions. Com. chap 3: 15, 16, and 1: 13. That men's lusts and passions are called the devil and satan in other passages has been shown. Instead of indulging these, we are called to resist them. Comp. verse 8. It is easily understood how we can resist such a devil as this; but we have no clear ideas on the subject, to understand it of an invisible, fallen angel. The terms devil and satan, being used to designate men's evil lusts and passions, appear to be the foundation of all the other senses in which those terms are used in Scripture. It was Judas' evil lusts, which made him a devil, and, on this account, these terms are used to designate the enemies of the gospel. In short, it is such evil lusts and passions, which make men satans or devils. Accordingly, it is difficult to decide in some texts, to which these terms are applied. Nor is it of importance to decide; hence, in some texts, we have given both views as agreeable to the scripture usage of these terms.

Jude 9. "Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the Devil (he disputed about the body of Moses) dust not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Whitby, in his preface to Jude, quoting from Dr. Lightfoot, says: "In citing the story of Michael, the archangel, contending with the Devil about the body of Moses, verse 9, he doth but the same that Paul doth, in naming Jannes and Jambres, 2 Tim. 3: 8, namely, allege a story which was current, and owned among that nation, though there was no such thing in Scripture; and so he argueth with them from their

own authors and concessions; for among the Talmudists, there seems to be something like the relics of such a matter, viz., of Michael and the angel of death disputing, or discoursing, about fetching away the soul of Moses." Jude here, then, reasons with the persons he addresses, on a received story among them, for the purpose of refuting their wicked conduct in speaking evil of dignities. In this, he acted as our Lord did, in reasoning on the popular opinion that Satan had bound a woman eighteen years, for the purpose of refuting his adversaries. But the truth of this story is no more admitted in the one case, than the correctness of the opinion is in the other. Both are introduced merely for the sake of argument, without any regard to their truth or falsehood. This story about Michael and the Devil must have been invented about the time of the Babylonish captivity, or soon after it. Before the captivity we never read of angels having names. Nor, before the captivity, does it appear that the Jews knew anything about a fallen angel called the Devil and Satan. Besides, the words which Michael used in dispute with the Devil, "The Lord rebuke thee," are taken from Zechariah 3: 2, and it is well known that Zechariah prophesied during the captivity. See on this passage Sect. III. The following quotation from Jahn not only shows us that similar opinions to that in the passage before us existed among the Jews, but when and how they came to adopt them. He says, pages 235, 6: "The more recent Hebrews, adhering too strictly to the letter of their Scriptures, exercised their ingenuity, and put in requisition their faith, to furnish the monarch Death with a subordinate agent or angel, viz., the prince of bad spirits, *ho diabolos*, otherwise called Sammael, and also Ashmedai, and known in the New Testament by the phrases, the prince of this world, the tempter, who hath the power of death. The Hebrews, accordingly, in enumerating the attributes and offices of the prime minister of the terrific king of Hades, represent him as in the habit of making his appearance in the presence of God,

and demanding at the hand of the Divinity the extinction, in any given instance, of human life. Having obtained permission to that effect, he does not fail of making a prompt exhibition of himself to the sick; he then gives them drops of poison, which they drink and die. Comp. John 14: 30, Hebrews 2: 14. Hence originate the phrases, 'to taste of death,' and 'to drink the cup of death,' which are found, also, among the Syrians, Arabians, and Persians. Matthew 16: 28; Mark 9: 1; Luke 9, 27; John 8: 52; Hebrews 2: 9." It appears from this quotation that "the more recent Hebrews" furnished death with an angel, the prince of bad spirits. But the ancient Hebrews knew nothing about such a being; and where could "the more recent Hebrews" imbibe such opinions but during their captivity, and from their intercourse with the heathen? See Section IV. Jahn allows that, "adhering too strictly to the letter of their Scriptures," they "exercised their ingenuity" to get such opinions. Christians have imbibed the Jewish opinions, and have exercised like ingenuity to find proof for them in the New Testament.

Rev. 2: 10. "Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the Devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days; be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." It will not be questioned that what John calls Satan, verses 9, 13, 24, and chap. 3: 9, he here calls the Devil. See remarks on all these passages, Section V., which are here sufficient for an illustration. Suffer me to ask, does any one believe that the Devil, a fallen angel, ever cast Christians into prison? No; but the adversaries of Christianity, then and since, have often done this. It will not answer to say the Devil, a fallen angel, influenced the enemies of the gospel to cast Christians into prison, for this would be assuming the point in question. But, are orthodox brethren aware that their faith in the influence of the Devil militates against the doctrine of total depravity? What

need is there of such a being? Total depravity is sufficient, without him, to produce all manner of wickedness. If men would be less wicked, without the Devil's influence, they are not so bad but he can make them worse; and who can say they would not be very good if he would only let them alone? Mankind are wicked enough, but their wickedness arises not from a fallen angel. "From whence come wars and fightings? Come they not hence of your lusts which war in your members?" Here we have the origin of sin.

SECTION VII.

ALL THE PASSAGES CONSIDERED, IN WHICH THE TERMS DEVIL AND SATAN ARE USED SYNONYMOUSLY.

THE first passages which present themselves for our consideration are Matt. 4: 1—12; Mark 1: 12, 13, and Luke 4: 1—14, containing an account of our Lord's temptation. Most religious people interpret this account literally. But concerning a literal interpretation, Essenus writes, pp. 117—120: "The history of our Lord's temptation is commonly understood in a literal sense. Satan is supposed to be a real being; to have actually appeared and conversed with our Saviour. Having taken him up through the air to the top of the temple, and thence to some high mountain, he tempted him in the manner represented in the narrative. This interpretation is loaded not only with difficulties, but even with absurdities shocking to common sense. The learned Mr. Farmer has examined the question; and his objections to the literal translation are so numerous and decisive, that no thinking person can accede to it, without abandoning the first and most obvious principle of reason, and the tenor of the gospel. 'Why the Devil at all as-

saulted our Lord, and what advantage he could possibly gain over him, has,' he observes, 'always been acknowledged to be a great difficulty, by the advocates of the common interpretation.' But this difficulty is increased by the manner the Devil proposed his temptation to our Lord. For he came to him in person, and urged temptations such as could proceed only from an evil being. Now with what prospect of success could he tempt our Lord, if he thus exposed himself to open view? By a personal and undisguised appearance, he can never hope to prevail over the feeblest virtues, much less could he expect the illustrious person, whom he knew to be the Son of God, and who knew him to be the Devil, to comply with his temptation.*

* The difficulty to which Mr. Farmer here refers, is one that has troubled many advocates of the common opinion concerning the personality of the Devil. Rev. Wm. A. Stearns, D. D., of Cambridge, in the January number of the Bibliotheca Sacra and American Biblical Repository, of 1854, in an article on The Temptation in the Wilderness, denies the visible bodily presence of the tempter, while he advocates his actual personal existence. We can well conceive why he should deny the former; for it is quite too absurd to suppose that in bodily form the Devil led Christ about from place to place, carried him through the air to the pinnacle of the temple, and then to a high mountain, where he showed him all the kingdoms of the world; but we do not see why he should deny this, and yet contend that the account proves the personal existence of the Devil; for the language used expressly asserts his bodily visible presence. In the March number of the Christian Examiner of 1854, Rev. G. E. Ellis, in a notice of the article by Mr. Stearns, says, "Now there are no more positive words used in the Bible, expressive of the actual personal existence of Satan, than are used to signify his actual, visible, bodily appearance to the Saviour. It is said that the Devil 'came to Jesus'; that 'he said' several distinct things to him; that 'he taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple'; that 'he taketh him up into' a mountain, and 'showeth him all the kingdoms of the world,' &c., and made him a very positive offer on a condition; and, finally, it is said that he 'leaveth' Jesus 'for a season.' But how is it that all these verbs of speech, action, and motion, lose their literal signification in this instance, and become merely figurative, while the little verb of existence, which states in some of its tenses the personality of a spirit of wickedness, must be religiously held to for the letter of what it asserts?" The same rule, in regard to figurative language, which Mr. Stearns would use to justify his denial of the bodily presence of the Devil, we can use in justifying a denial of his personal

"In the first temptation, in which Jesus is solicited to turn stones into bread, nothing is promised on the part of Satan to gain his consent; the request of an implacable enemy, when no advantage attends it, being in itself a reason for rejecting it. But Satan defeats his own temptation by asking an useless favor.

"While the foe betrays great folly in the first temptation, he supposes Christ to be actuated by still greater in the second. The people, on seeing Jesus throwing himself from the top of the temple, might conclude that he was the Son of God. But he knew that the tempter had it in his power to lead them to draw the same conclusion of himself. Satan, also, would throw himself down unhurt; and his miraculous preservation would prove him, as well as Jesus, to be the Son of God. Nay, he might claim the superiority; for it was a greater exertion of power to convey him from the wilderness to the top of the temple, than in sustaining his fall to the court below. What inducement, then, could Christ have for a compliance with the proposal suggested? Would he be disposed to gratify Satan, by doing an act at his mere

existence; for one is no more asserted than the other. The fact is, we must either take the account as a history of an actual occurrence, or else say that the tempter was a representation of impersonal evil. Mr. Ellis, in the article from which we have quoted, very justly says: "Dr. Stearns thinks that the actual personal existence of a Devil is one of the most positive doctrines in the New Testament. But there is not a single passage in Scripture which may not be relieved of that inference as easily as the essay before us rids the temptation of Jesus of the visible presence of the tempter. Besides, there are many references to such an agency, which positively require us to regard the words devil and satan as simply personifications of evil. What did the Saviour mean when he said, 'I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven'? To say nothing of the implication that Satan, if in heaven, was out of his place, does the passage assert a literal sight of his descent? But if it be answered that the vision is figurative, why may we not say the same of the object of the vision, and render the passage, 'I saw the power of wickedness falling from its high place, and yielding to the might of holiness and truth'? When Jesus says to the Pharisees, 'Ye are of your father, the Devil,' does he really imply that they were the children of that Evil One? If he did, they certainly might have quoted one of the commandments, — 'Honor thy father,' — as a reason for their allegiance to the Devil." — O. A. S.

suggestion? Was he to acquire any glory, or advantage to himself? No; on the contrary, he would only have incurred the infamy of having entered the lists with the Devil, without having acquired any superiority over him.

"With regard to the third temptation, the Son of God knew that the father of lies had not the empire of the world at his disposal, and that he, therefore, promised what he had not power to perform. Such a promise was rather an insult than a temptation, and was calculated only to provoke scorn or resentment. Could the Devil, then, hope by such contemptuous treatment, to engage the Son of God to listen to his accursed counsels; and to seduce him to an act of the highest dishonor to his heavenly Father, that of paying divine homage to this infernal spirit? This interpretation represents the old serpent as acting quite out of character, and supposes him to be as void of policy as he is of goodness; inasmuch he used the least art in proposing temptations, where the greatest would have been insufficient to insure success.

"The common opinion further ascribes to Satan the greatest miracles. It supposes that the Devil, by nature a spiritual and invisible agent, has a power of assuming at pleasure a corporeal or invisible form, and of speaking with an audible voice; though there is no more ground from experience (our sole instructor in the established law of nature), to ascribe this power to the Devil, than to ascribe life to the inanimate, or speech to the brute creation.

"It is a still greater objection to the common opinion that it ascribes to the Devil the performance of things not only preternatural, but absurd and impossible. Such we must reckon his showing Christ all the kingdoms of the world from an exceedingly high mountain; for, the earth being a spheroidical figure, what single mountain can command a view of all the parts of it, or those in particular which are opposite to each other? The sun itself, at its immense height above the loftiest mountains

of our globe, commands and enlightens, at once, only a single hemisphere. Could the Devil, then, from one point of view, show Christ not only the entire circumference of the globe, but, also, whatever constitutes the glory and grandeur of its kingdoms; and show him such infinitely numerous objects, in situations so distant and so opposite, not gradually and successively, but in one and the same instant of time? This does not seem so properly a miracle, as an absurdity and contradiction."

The question will now be asked, If our Lord was not literally tempted of the Devil, a fallen angel, how is this account to be understood? Before directly answering this question, we shall make some general remarks on it, in connection with its context. The following things then, appear obvious:—It is evident that our Lord's temptation took place immediately after the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him, and just before he entered on his public ministry. His temptation was passing trial for the work given him to do, and in which he was about to engage. Again; it is equally obvious that the tempter did not lead our Lord out into the wilderness for the purpose of tempting him, but, on the contrary, he was led out there by the Spirit of God, to be tempted of the Devil. See Matt. 3: 16; 4: 1, and Luke 4: 1, compared with verse 14. Again; all will allow that "devil," "satan," and "the tempter," are used as synonymous terms. Nor, is it less apparent that our Lord's temptation is related by all the three historians, without any suspicion on their part that it was to be misunderstood. They use the terms devil, wilderness, satan, spirit of God, and tempter, as what would be alike easily understood by their readers. But, again; it is taken for granted in this account, and is plain from many other parts of Scripture, that our Lord was susceptible of temptation. To deny this, is to say Jesus was not a partaker in flesh and blood with the children, Heb. 2: 14; that he was not tempted; for without such things we may as well speak of tempting a tree or a stone. But he suf-

fered, being tempted, and is able to succor them that are tempted, Heb. 2: 15. He was hungry, and thirsty, and weary, as we are; he was sorrowful, and joyful, felt pain and enjoyed ease. In short, he was pleased and angry, Mark 3: 5; was grateful for kindness, and felt an insult, as could be shown, if it were necessary. Many good people seem to forget that sin does not consist in having such appetites and passions, but in their indulgence in a way and to an extent which God has prohibited. They only render their possessor susceptible of sinning. Jesus was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Heb. 4: 16. I may just add that the tempter, here mentioned, like the tempter which deceived Eve, professed to be our Lord's friend, and that listening to the proposals made would be for his advantage. This is apparent from comparing the two accounts. With these general remarks in view, let us attend to the

First temptation of our Lord. "And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterwards an hungered. And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." To fast, in scripture language, does not always mean total abstinence from food during the period persons are said to fast, but using a less quantity, and coarser kind of food. See the book of Daniel, and other passages. When it is said, Luke 4: 2, that our Lord "did eat nothing" during forty days, it seems, from comparing Acts 27: 33, to mean nothing more than that he had no regular meals. Without a miracle, he could not have lived forty days entirely without food, and no miracle is supposed to have been wrought to sustain him. Nor is it easily perceived why it would have been sin to turn stones to bread, yet no sin to work a miracle to support nature without food. It might have been said that our Lord fasted forty days, if he ate only such food as was furnished him by the fields. It is evident that his fasting gave rise to the first temptation. What tempter came to him? What other but his hunger? No other

tempter in this case was necessary. Unless our Lord was sustained by a miracle, he must have felt the sensations of hunger; but it was not until then that his appetite became clamorous for food, and tempted him, to "command that these stones be made bread." What said this? Was it not the craving of his bodily appetite for food? It suggested a miracle to be wrought. It has suggested to many, since, to steal to satisfy its cravings, and God who remembers that we are dust, has sometimes interposed by miracle to satisfy it. Even "men do not despise a thief, if he steal to satisfy his soul when he is hungry." Prov. 6 : 30. Comp. verse 31. There are some points of similarity and dissimilarity between Eve's temptation and that of our Lord's, which deserve to be noticed. For example; bodily appetite was the tempter in both cases, and in both a dialogue between them and their appetite is represented as having taken place. But notice, when Eve lusted after the fruit, she had all the other trees from which to supply her necessities. Her appetite did not become a tempter to her from want, but took occasion from the restraint which God had laid on it, in prohibiting the use of one tree of the garden. She listened to the voice of her appetite, and sinned. But our Lord's appetite became a tempter to him from want of food, and sought to seduce him to work a miracle for a supply. But he repelled the temptation by saying, verse 4, "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." It was no sin in Eve or our Lord to have the appetite, or to gratify it. It became sin in Eve to gratify her appetite from that which God had prohibited. It would have been sin in Jesus to have wrought a miracle to gratify his appetite, for his divine power was not given him for this purpose, but to establish his mission as the Saviour of the world. To have complied with the temptation would have shown his want of trust in God, and been an improper exercise of his power. To say that our Lord was hungry, yet felt no inclination

to enjoy food, is in other words telling us that he was not hungry, and denying that this was any temptation. But feeling all the painful sensations of hunger, and having the power to turn stones to bread, yet resisting the suggestion, could only be done by him who was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, or evil desire.

2d. Our Lord's second temptation is related verse 5—8. "Then the Devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." What tempter now assailed our Lord? In order to answer this question several things must be noticed. The scene of this temptation is not laid in the wilderness, but in Jerusalem, and at the temple, where all the tribes of Israel assembled to worship. Further, the Jews at that time were not only in high expectation of the Messiah's appearance, but they expected him to come in a miraculous way for their deliverance and glory. The scene is laid at the place suited to the nature of the temptation. On the other hand, our Lord was just about to enter on the work given him to do. Unless we say that he was ignorant and stoical, we must allow him to feel sensibly, in view of the sufferings which awaited him. In fact, if we admit that he foresaw what afterwards took place, and was not deeply affected by the prospect, yea, wished if possible to avoid it, we must believe him destitute of the common feelings and sinless frailties of our nature. If, after he had learned obedience by the things which he suffered, he said, "Father, let this cup pass from me," can any man think that nature would not say the same, yea, suggest some mode of escaping them, when he surveyed the whole scene of suffering at the commencement? To deny this, is to deny that our Lord was a man, and a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; that he possessed the fine

feelings and tender sensibilities which were so conspicuous in him. It is, in fact, saying, our Lord was totally unconcerned about the success of his future ministry among the Jews; that he had no desire that they should receive him as the true Messiah; and that no reflections passed through his mind respecting the best manner in which he might gain the attention and affections of his nation. What, then, was the tempter? It was flesh and blood suggesting the propriety of accommodating himself to the prevailing opinions and expectations of the Jews to secure his success; or their prevailing expectations and opinions presented themselves to his mind, pointing out a course, which, if pursued, would save him from all opposition from them, and cause him to be received as their Messiah. What was this? The Jews expected their Messiah to come from heaven, or in a miraculous manner. This is generally admitted. It was suggested, Cast thyself down from the pinnacle of the temple among them, while at worship in the court below; seeing you fall from such a stupendous height unhurt, they will immediately receive you as the Messiah, and invest you with all the honors, powers and emoluments, of the Jewish church. Since thou art the Son of God, there can be no danger, "for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone." But our Lord did not listen to flesh and blood, or yield to the principles of accommodation, but repelled the temptation by saying, "It is written, again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." A compliance with it would have been presumption, a perversion of Scripture in justification of it, and doing evil that good might come. It would have been sacrificing truth at the shrine of prejudice and popular opinion, and shrinking from trials and sufferings through which he must pass, if he would accomplish the end of his mission. "It behoved Christ to suffer," Luke 24: 46.

3d. The third temptation is stated in verses 8, 9.—

"Again, the Devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them; and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." What devil now tempted our Lord? It was certainly that which said to him, "If thou wilt fall down and worship me;" and which said, Luke 4: 6, "All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them; for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine." Well, allow me to ask, had a fallen angel all these things at his disposal? Could he confer all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them? No man will say so; nor does our Lord call him a liar or deceiver, in promising such things. What then promised, and could confer, all these things on our Lord? I answer: In the days of our Lord the power of the Romans had subdued all the then known world. To whomsoever they would they gave its kingdoms and the glory of them. This was done by the force of arms. If our Lord would then make his extraordinary power the means of propagating his kingdom, he might raise himself to the head of the Roman Empire, or become master of the whole world. The tempter was, then, the glory and grandeur of the world presented to the Saviour's mind, to excite his ambition to use his power in raising himself to universal empire. But this temptation he repelled by saying, "Get thee hence, Satan (or adversary), for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." It is added, that Satan departed from him for a season; which intimates that our Lord was assailed with similar temptations afterwards. But was he ever tempted afterwards by a fallen angel or evil spirit? Nothing of the kind appears, but he was certainly tempted afterwards with like temptations to those I have mentioned. In short, these three temptations are, for substance, all the various temptations with which our Lord was assailed during his ministry. Indeed, they com-

prise all that is in the world, which prove tempters to mankind. "The lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," 1 John 2: 16. Was not our Lord, during his ministry, repeatedly hungry, and under temptation to supply his wants by his divine power? Certainly he was, but we find he always resisted such a temptation, and trusted in God for food, in the ordinary course of Providence. Again, was he not under strong temptations to sacrifice truth and duty to the prejudices and opinions of the Jews, in order to make his ministry useful among them? No one will deny this. But, do we ever find him making sinful compliances with them, to induce them to receive him as their Messiah? No, he was deaf to all such temptations and allurements. Again, during his ministry he had temptations presented to him to raise himself to a throne, yea, to the empire of the world. The people, seeing his power, on one occasion would have come by force to make him a king. But did he encourage them, or avail himself of this, to raise himself to honor and glory? All know the reverse of this was the case. He was likewise accused of making himself a king. But he repelled the charge by saying his kingdom was not of this world. All these temptations our Lord encountered during his ministry, but was superior to them all. He suffered, being tempted, that he might know how to succor them that are tempted. But, alas! how many "Vicars of Bray" have professed to be his servants, who have counted gain godliness, and sacrificed everything for the honor, the power, and the wealth of the world!

Such are my views of our Lord's temptation; but my limits forbid entering more into a detail of the evidence whereby they might be supported. It is easily perceived that these views are in accordance with the meaning of the terms devil and satan, as used in other parts of Scripture, and agree to the tempter which tempts men every day. But to understand a fallen angel designated by these terms, is not supported by other parts of Scrip-

ture, and involves this account in absurdities and utter impossibilities.

Mark 4: 15. "And these are they by the wayside, where the word is sown; but when they have heard, Satan cometh immediately, and taketh away the word that was sown in their hearts." By comparing Luke 8: 12, the Devil is said to do this, and in Matt. 13: 19, it is said to be done by "the wicked one," or rather "the wicked," for "one" is in italic. What satan, devil, or wicked one, then, took away the seed of the word sown in men's hearts? It has been shown that the terms devil and satan are often used to designate the Jews, the adversaries of our Lord and his doctrine. That they were wicked persons no one questions. It is, then, agreeable to the fact, that, as soon as our Lord sowed the good seed of the word, they were ready to prevent its salutary effects on the minds of his hearers, by contradicting and blaspheming it. Every scheme was devised by them to excite popular prejudice against our Lord and his doctrine. No assistance from a fallen angel was needed in this case, for we are told such hearers of the word did not understand it. What is not understood and believed, is little regarded, soon forgotten, and easily parted with; and especially if public prejudice be against it. If we were even to say, men's evil lusts and passions were the devil and satan that took away the seed of the word from their minds, it would be in agreement with the scripture usage of these terms. How the seed could be taken away by means of either of these is easily understood, but how it could be removed by a fallen angel is to me inexplicable. Let it be remembered that it is nowhere said that such a being made use of them as his tools to accomplish this. See quotations from John, above.

Rev. 12: 9. "And the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world: he was cast out into the earth, and his angels were cast out with him." See verses 10, 11, 12, yea, the whole chapter. Again, it is said, Rev.

20: 1, 2, "And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years." See the whole chapter. In these two passages we have John's authority for saying that the great dragon, old serpent, devil, satan, and accuser of the brethren, all mean the same thing. This thing, or being, is also said to deceive "the whole world." It is from these two passages, chiefly, that people conclude that the serpent which deceived Eve was a fallen angel; for here, say they, "the Devil and Satan is called that *old* serpent, and we know that the Devil is a fallen angel." And how do they know all this so clearly and confidently? Their fathers, their catechisms, and their ministers, have told them so: and this conclusion is drawn too from a book so highly figurative, that no man has hitherto been able satisfactorily to explain it. Notwithstanding this is frankly owned by every candid man, yet from this very book the strongest proofs are generally adduced for a personal Devil, and eternal punishment. We would respectfully ask our orthodox brethren, why they allow the book of Revelation to be highly figurative or symbolical, yet give a literal interpretation to the above passages concerning the serpent, Devil, and Satan? We would affectionately press it on their attention, why they interpret the parts of these passages concerning the Devil and Satan literally, and yet would refuse to go through with a literal interpretation of them? I shall give a specimen of the absurdities which such a literal interpretation involves. It must then be believed that the Devil has seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns on his heads. And it must be believed that Michael and his angels had a battle with the Devil and his angels, and that it was fought in heaven. Besides, our orthodox friends ought to inform us how the Devil got back to heaven to fight this battle there, seeing they believe he fell from heaven before he tempted Eve. In short, he

has been in heaven and fallen from it a number of times, if such principles of scripture interpretation are admitted. He fell from heaven before Eve's temptation. He fell again when the seventy were sent out to preach. And John, in the above chapters, informs us that he was cast out of heaven to the earth a third time. And if Lucifer be the Devil, he has at least had four falls from heaven, for it is said, "How art thou fallen from heaven, Lucifer, son of the morning!"

Is it then asked what this great dragon, that old serpent, the Devil and Satan, was? Dr. Newton says, vol. iii. 135—139, speaking of this dragon: "We find the kings and people of Egypt, who were the great persecutors of the primitive church of Israel, distinguished by this title in several places of the Old Testament,—Psalm 74: 13; Isai. 51: 9; Ezek. 29: 3,—and with as much reason and propriety may the people and emperors of Rome, who were the great persecutors of the primitive church of Christ, be called by the same name, as they are actuated by the same principle. For that the Roman Empire was here figured, the characters and attributes of the dragon plainly evince." See the pages referred to.

Such are his remarks on the first of these passages. On the second he says: "After the destruction of the beast and of the false prophet, there still remains 'the dragon,' who had delegated his power to them, 'that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan:' but he is bound by 'an angel,' an especial minister of Providence; and the famous millennium commences, or the reign of the saints upon earth for a thousand years, verses 1—6. 'Binding him with a great chain, casting him into the bottomless pit, shutting him up, and setting a seal upon him,' are strong figures to show the strict and severe restraint which he should be laid under, 'that he might deceive the nations no more,' during the whole period. Wickedness being restrained, the reign of righteousness succeeds, and the administration of justice and

judgment is given to the saints of the Most High."—p. 205.

He adds, page 215: "At the expiration of the thousand years, verses 7—10, the restraint shall be taken off from wickedness, and for 'a little season,' as it was said before, verse 3, 'Satan shall be loosed out of his prison,' and make one effort more to reëstablish his kingdom. As he deceived our first parents in the paradisaical state, so he shall have the artifice 'to deceive the nations' in this millennial kingdom, to show that no state or condition upon earth is exempted and secured from sinning." I would only add that it is lust or evil desire "which deceiveth the whole world," and has been the source of its wars and bloodshed, James 4: 1—4. This is the universal deceiver.

We have now finished our investigation of all the texts in the Bible, where the terms devil and satan are used. Having expressed our own views of the different passages, we leave the candid reader to form his own opinions, and make his own reflections on the subject.

SECTION VIII.

ALL THE TEXTS CONSIDERED, WHERE THE DEVIL IS SUPPOSED TO BE CALLED THE EVIL ONE, THE TEMPTER, THE GREAT DRAGON, THE SERPENT, AND OLD SERPENT, THE PRINCE OF THIS WORLD, THE PRINCE OF THE POWER OF THE AIR, AND THE GOD OF THIS WORLD.

THESE names, given to the Devil, a supposed fallen angel, will require but a brief consideration, for some of them have been introduced in the preceding sections. Indeed, if devil and satan designate no such being in the Bible, it will be allowed by most people that he is not to be found in the Bible. But we shall not take this for granted. The Devil is then,

1st. Supposed to be called *o' poneros*, the evil one, or, the wicked one. This word is rendered, in the common version, evil, wicked, wickedness, harm, &c. The sacred writers use it to express evil or wickedness in a variety of ways; such as evil or unclean spirits, Matt. 12: 45; Acts 19: 12, 13, 15, 16; Luke 7: 21; 8: 2, and 11: 26. An evil or unclean spirit is the same as an evil or unclean demon, and has no connection with our present subject. This word is used to express moral evil, Matt. 5: 37; 1 Thess. 5: 22; 2 Thess. 3: 3; John 17: 15. Physicial evil, Acts 28: 21; Rev. 16: 2; Matt. 5: 39. The day of persecution is called the evil day, Eph. 6: 13. The heart of man, from whence all evil proceeds, is called "an evil heart of unbelief," Heb. 3: 12. Out of this source proceed evil thoughts, Matt. 9: 4; Luke 11: 29; James 2: 4; Matt. 12: 35; Luke 6: 45. Also, wicked and malicious words, 3 John 10; Matt. 5: 11; Luke 6: 22. Also, evil works or deeds, Matt. 12: 35; Mark 7: 23; Matt. 15: 19; Luke 6: 45; John 3: 19, and 7: 7; James 4: 16; Col. 1: 21; 2 John 11; Acts 28; 21; Rom. 12: 9; 2 Tim. 4: 18; Luke 3: 19; Matt. 7: 17, 18. Men practising wickedness, are hence called evil, or wicked persons, Matt. 12: 39; 16: 4; 7: 11, and 12: 34; Luke 11: 13; 2 Tim. 3: 13; Luke 6: 45; 1 Cor. 5: 13; Matt. 5: 45; 13: 49, and 22: 10; Luke 6: 35; Acts 17: 5; 2 Thess. 3: 2. Such wicked persons have an evil conscience, Heb. 10: 22. An evil eye, Matt. 6: 23, and 20: 15; Mark 7: 22; Luke 11: 34. Become evil servants, in various conditions of life, Matt. 18: 32, and 25: 26; Luke 19: 22. And as evil or wickedness prevails, the world or age is said to be evil, Gal. 1: 4. Such is a brief review of all the places where the word *poneros* occurs, except the following, and are the only passages where any one can suppose this word designates an evil being or fallen angel.

Matt. 6: 13. "Deliver us from the evil." See also

Luke 11 : 4, where the same language is used. Some have said, this expression means, "Deliver us from the evil *one*," thereby meaning the Devil, a fallen angel. But the word *one* does not occur in the original, is not even in the common version, nor does the scope of the passage require it. Such a mode of establishing this doctrine, does not require a serious refutation. In Matt. 13 : 19, the phrase "wicked one" occurs, but the word *one* is in italic, which might be omitted, or the word person, or thing, substituted in its place. But, as it has been shown in the last section that this phrase is synonymous with devil and satan, and has no reference to a fallen angel, it requires no further notice here. The same remarks apply to Matt. 13 : 38, which has been sufficiently considered already. The expressions "the tares are the children of the wicked," and "the good seed are the children of the kingdom," are explained by the quotation from Professor Stuart on John 8 : 44, above. "Children of the wicked one" simply means "wicked children," or, "children of wickedness." The Improved Version, in a note on this passage, says, "Sons of the evil one" are wicked men. Such, in the Old Testament, are called sons of Belial, or worthlessness, that is, worthless men, 1 Sam. 2 : 12; 1 Kings 21 : 10. See 2 Cor. 6 : 15. In 1 John 2 : 13, 14, the phrase "wicked one" is used twice. The word *one* is not put in italic type, but ought to have been, for there is no reason for this alteration. See also Eph. 6 : 16; 1 John 3 : 12, and 5 : 18, 19, where the wicked, or evil one, or thing, is also mentioned. The contexts of these passages show that the word thing might be substituted for the word one. Take the last passage for an example. The wicked one or thing, which toucheth or rather hurteth not those who are born of God, is that from which they keep themselves, and this is sin, for it is said, "Whosoever is born of God sinneth not," verse 18. This is confirmed from verse 19, for John adds, "We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness, or sin," or, simply, evil. See,

on all these passages, our remarks on the passages where the devil and satan are mentioned, and which are synonymous terms with evil or wicked one. I shall only add from Wakefield, on Matt. 5: 37. "The evil one. So I render again, verse 39, and in other places; as our translators rightly render below. Nearly in the same manner, 13: 19, and elsewhere, the wicked one. Whatever is calculated to seduce men to sin, is represented by the sacred writers under the figure of a living agent, called the evil one—the adversary—the enemy—the devil, and satan."

2d. The Devil is also supposed to be called "*o' opeiradzon*, the tempter." This word is rendered to tempt, to try, to prove. The following are all the places where it occurs in the New Testament. James 1: 13, 14; Gal. 6: 1; Rev. 2: 10; Acts 15: 10; 2 Cor. 13: 5; 1 Cor. 7: 5; Heb. 11: 17; John 6: 6; 1 Thess. 3: 5; Acts 5: 9; Rev. 3: 10; 1 Cor. 10: 13; Matt. 22: 18; Mark 12: 15; Luke 20: 23; Heb. 2: 18; Mark 1: 13; Luke 4: 2; Matt. 16: 1, and 19: 3; Mark 8: 11, and 10: 2; Luke 11: 16; John 8: 6; Matt. 4: 1, and 22: 35; Heb. 4: 15. We have given book, chapter and verse, that the reader may consult the passages and see if, in any one of them, the tempter mentioned refers to such a being. The following are the only places from which such a thing could be supposed.

Matt. 4: 3, Mark 1: 13, and Luke 4: 2, 13, have already been noticed in considering our Lord's temptation, and require no further attention. If the devil and satan do not refer to a fallen angel, the tempter cannot, for it is allowed these terms are used as names for the same thing. In 1 Thess. 3: 5, it is said, "For this cause, when I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you and our labor be in vain." What tempter did the apostle refer to? Answer: we have seen from various passages, that the principle of evil, or sensual desire, is

the tempter, and is called the Devil and Satan. Indeed, this is the foundation of the other senses in which these words are used. This principle operated in every possible way in the opposers of Christianity, whom Paul calls Satan, chap. 2 : 18, noticed, Sect. V. The Thessalonians were called to suffer persecution from them, chap. 3 : 3, 4. They were also liable to be influenced by the principle of evil or sensual desire. Anxious for their steadfastness in the faith, the apostle expresses his fear lest by some means the tempter had tempted them, and his labor prove vain. This view is confirmed, from verses 6, 7, where we are informed what relieved the apostle's anxiety of mind. It was not that a fallen angel had not succeeded in tempting them, but merely that their faith and charity continued.

3d. The Devil is also supposed to be called "the dragon," and "the great red dragon," Rev. chaps. 12, 13, 16, 20. But sufficient has been said on these passages in the last section, to which we refer the reader.

4th. The Devil is also believed, to be called "the serpent," and "that old serpent." We have noticed Gen. 3 sufficiently in Section II. The phrase, "that old serpent," has also been very fully considered Sect. VII. The only other text relative to this subject, is 2 Cor. 11 : 3. "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity which is in Christ." See some remarks on this passage, Sect. II. What I would observe further, here, is, 1st. Had Paul believed, as a great many do now, that a fallen angel or wicked spirit beguiled Eve, would he not have said so? Let any candid man consider, if he would merely say the serpent beguiled her. Is any account given in Scripture of the fall of such an angel from heaven? If there be, we will thank any man to point it out. Paul does not even say that "old serpent," or "that old serpent, the Devil, and Satan." This is a more remarkable omission, as in this very chapter he speaks of Satan being transformed

into an angel of light. 2d. We allow, yea, contend that the serpent is the same as the Devil and Satan, and they are used in Scripture as convertible terms to express the same thing. As to this point, we agree perfectly with our orthodox friends. We only contend that neither the Devil nor Satan is a fallen angel, or evil being, as they suppose. What then is the tempter, the Devil, and Satan, of which the Scriptures speak? James says, "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." This is the real original serpent, devil, or tempter, as has been shown on various texts in the course of our remarks. See Sect. II. particularly. No man could be tempted, unless he had lusts or desires. The Saviour was incapable of being tempted without them. 3d. Eve was beguiled by the serpent, or her desire after what was forbidden, and the apostle was in fear concerning the Corinthians, lest by any means their minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ. He does not intimate that he was in fear that a fallen angel would do this. No, his fear was, lest by any means this might be done, and, in the course of the chapter, he points not to a fallen angel as the agent, but to false teachers, who preached another gospel to them, and whom, verse 13, he calls "false apostles," and "deceitful workers." In Sect. II. it has been shown that the serpent is the symbol of deceit.

5th. The Devil is also supposed to be called the prince of this world (*ὁ arkōn*). This word occurs in Luke 12: 58; 23: 13; Acts 4: 5; Luke 23: 35; 24: 20; John 7: 20; Acts 3: 17; 4: 8, 26; 13: 27; Rom. 13: 3; Matt. 9: 23; John 7: 48; Acts 14: 5; 7: 27, 35; 16: 19; Acts 23: 5; Matt. 20: 25; 1 Cor. 2: 6, 8; Luke 14: 1; Matt. 9: 18; Luke 8: 41; 18: 18; John 3: 1; 12: 42. The word in the above texts is rendered chief, ruler, magistrate, prince, &c. It is applied to men as rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, and that whether Jewish or heathen. In the following texts it is rendered prince, and refers to the prince of

the demons, or, as it is rendered in our version, devils, Matt. 9 : 34 ; 12 : 24 ; Mark 3 : 22 ; Luke 11 : 15. Beelzebub was the prince of the demons. But that this heathen god had no reference to Satan or the Devil, see Dr. Campbell's sixth Dissertation. In Eph. 2 : 2, this word occurs, and is rendered prince, which will be considered presently. The only passages where it is supposed a reference is had to the Devil are the following, which I shall quote altogether, and then submit some remarks on them for consideration.

John 12 : 31. "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince (*ó arkōn*) of this world be cast out." And 14 : 30. "Hereafter I will not talk much with you : for the prince (*ó arkōn*) of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me." And 16 : 8—12. "And when he (the comforter) is come, he will reprove the world of judgment, because the prince (*ó arkōn*) of this world is judged." On these passages, the principal question we have to consider is, who or what did our Lord refer to by "the prince of this world"? Orthodox people say, "the Devil, a fallen angel." But that our Lord, by "the prince of this world," meant the then reigning civil and ecclesiastical rulers, I shall now attempt to prove.

1st. This view is in agreement with the general, yea, almost universal, usage of the word *arhon* in the New Testament. Let any one turn to all the above texts, and he must be convinced of this ; for this word is rendered magistrate, ruler, prince, &c., and applied to the rulers, both civil and ecclesiastical, then existing in Judea. It is not once used in reference to a fallen angel unless in the three texts just quoted.

2d. Consider the scope and connection of Christ's discourse, where he speaks of the prince of this world. The three texts where this is mentioned all occur in discourses of our Lord, only related by John. They were spoken by our Lord to his disciples in reference to, and in view of, his apprehension, sufferings and death. The

context of these passages shows this, which the reader is desired to consult. As to the first, consult verses 27—34, and it will be seen that our Lord was speaking in view of the hour of his crucifixion. As to the last two, they occur in that discourse delivered partly in the upper room where he had eaten the last passover, and partly on the road thence to the garden where he was apprehended. In chap. 14: 30, he says, "The prince of this world cometh;" and at verse 31, he adds, "But that the world may know that I love the Father; and as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. Arise, let us go hence." Go where? Evidently to the garden, where he was apprehended. See chap. 18: 15.

3d. The fact of the case shows, that by "the prince of this world," our Lord referred to the civil and ecclesiastical power, and not to a fallen angel. Let any one consult the history of our Lord's life, from the time he uttered these words until he died on the cross, and he will find nothing that looks like a fallen angel or devil coming to him. Well, did those powers come to him? Nothing can be more certain. Our Lord had no sooner ended his discourse, in chaps. 14, 15, 16, 17, than we are told, chap. 18: 1, "When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples over the brook Cedron, where was a garden, into which he entered, and his disciples." Well, what came to him here? From verse 3, and onward, we are informed that Jesus was apprehended by the civil authority, urged on by the ecclesiastical. The prince of this world, or, as the word is rendered in other places, the ruler or magistrate of this world came. Our Lord, no doubt, knew all that Judas, the chief priests, and civil authorities, were engaged in for his apprehension. Hence he says, chap. 14: 30, "The prince of this world cometh" (*erhatai*). To testify to the world his love to the Father, and obedience to his commandment to lay down his life, he says to his disciples, verse 31, "Arise, let us go hence." He proceeds to the garden, where he knew Judas and the officers

were coming to apprehend him. He foresaw their coming, and says, "The prince or ruler of this world cometh," and he goes forth voluntarily to meet the result. Accordingly, in chap. 18: 3, it is said, "Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh (*erhatai*) thither with lanterns, and torches, and weapons." The chapter throughout shows all that took place afterwards, which the reader would do well to consult.

4th. The above is confirmed from the words which follow. He said, "The prince of this world cometh," and immediately adds, "and hath nothing in me." By this is generally understood, that the Devil, a fallen angel, had nothing of sin or corruption in the Saviour whereon to work. But this interpretation is perfectly gratuitous, for there is no evidence that this was our Lord's meaning. But, on the view which I have given of the prince of this world, it is consonant to truth, and evidence stated in the context. Thus, when our Lord was taken before Pilate, and he had examined the case, what does Pilate say? His words are remarkable: "I find in him no fault at all," chap. 18: 38. Very similar to those of our Lord: "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me," or against me.

5th. My view is also confirmed from the words which immediately precede the expression, "the prince of this world cometh." They stand thus: "Hereafter I will not talk much with you." Why not? Our Lord answers, "For the prince of this world cometh." Was the Devil, a fallen angel, to prevent his talking with his disciples? This must be affirmed, if we say he referred to such a being. But how could he prevent his talking with his disciples? Let those explain this who believe it. It is easily perceived how he was prevented, with my views. The moment he was apprehended in the garden, his disciples forsook him and fled, and from this period, being in the hands of his enemies, he was not at liberty

to talk much with his disciples, nor had he much opportunity, if even liberty had been allowed him.

6th. The only thing remaining, which deserves notice, is the following: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out." The word here rendered judgment, signifies condemned or condemnation, and is so rendered in other places. Is it asked how the world were condemned? I answer, by their rejecting and crucifying Christ, John 3: 18, 19. Is it asked how the prince or powers of this world were cast out? By putting to death the Lord of glory, the Jews filled up the measure of their iniquity, and from that hour were cast out from being the people of God, and have been so for nearly two thousand years. They were the chief persons concerned in our Lord's crucifixion, for the Roman power was only called in to effect their purpose. Pilate showed how unwilling he was to condemn Jesus contrary to all law and justice.

7th. The Devil is also supposed to be called "the prince of the power of the air." Eph. 2: 2. Wakefield renders the passage thus — "Conformably to the ruler of this empire of darkness, the spirit that now showeth its power in the sons of disobedience." "It was the opinion, both of the Jews and heathen," says Whitby on this text, "that the air was full of spirits called demons; that from the earth to the firmament, all things were full of these companies or rulers; and that there was a prince over them, who was called the governor of the world, that is, of the darkness of it." This agrees to Zoroaster's angel of darkness, who was considered the author and director of all evil. The apostle evidently here alludes to this heathen notion, but he told the Ephesians that this prince or governor of the world was the spirit that wrought in the children of disobedience. The evil or wickedness of men's minds is the true devil, satan, or governor of this world.

8th. The Devil is also supposed to be called "the god of this world." 2 Cor. 4: 4. "In whom the god of

this world (*aionos*) hath blinded the minds of them that believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." The god of this world, mentioned here, is the same as the prince or power of the air, in the last, which, Whitby says, they called governor of this world, that is, of the darkness of it. But the apostle declares that this governor of the world, prince of the power of the air, or god of this world, was the spirit that wrought in the children of disobedience. This view is agreeable to the words before us, for this certainly blinded the minds of them which believed not.

We have now finished our remarks on all the passages which are supposed to contain the names and titles of an evil being in the universe, an angel who fell from heaven, and deemed by most Christians but little inferior in power to its Creator. We have stated our views frankly, but in some cases very briefly. The texts on which the greatest dependence is placed have been considered pretty fully. The result of this investigation is, a deep conviction, that, the more the subject is examined, it will be found that the Bible gives no countenance to that evil being Christians call the Devil and Satan. But of this our readers must judge for themselves.

SECTION IX.

FACTS STATED, SHOWING THAT THE DEVIL IS NOT A FALLEN ANGEL OR REAL BEING.

In the preceding sections, several facts have been developed, showing that the Devil is not a fallen angel. We shall now very briefly advert to some other facts, not easily reconciled with this doctrine.

1st. No distinct account is given in Scripture of an angel of God sinning in heaven, thereby becoming a

devil, and on account of which he was cast out of it. When proof is demanded of such things, we are referred to texts where Satan or the Devil is said to have fallen from heaven, and to be cast out into the earth. But we have shown that the sacred writers attached no such ideas to those passages; and, by quotations from Jahn, Newton, and other eminent critics, that a very different thing was intended. Is it too much to expect that such a remarkable event would be clearly and repeatedly mentioned, yea, recorded previous to the account given of the fall of man? If true, would all the sacred writers have been silent about it? This is contrary to God's usual method with men. When God was about to destroy the world by a flood, and the cities of the plain by fire, he forewarned the people of their danger, so as to avoid the consequences. But concerning a holy angel becoming a devil in heaven, his fall from it, and the direful consequences which resulted to our race, God says nothing. The want of such information is indisputable, and we think that no man will affirm that this is either like God's usual dealings with men, or that he assigns any reason for withholding such information. How, then, do our orthodox friends account for all this, and where did they obtain such explicit information as they generally give to people about a fallen angel, and the consequences of his fall upon the human race? Was it from Paradise Lost and the Apocrypha, or was it from the Scriptures? We beg of them to reëxamine this subject.

2d. If it be true that an angel fell from heaven, and has been walking about in the world seeking whom he might devour, for nearly six thousand years, how is it to be accounted for that no sacred writer asserts that any person ever saw him, or had personal intercourse with him? They repeatedly inform us of persons seeing good angels, and relate the conversations which men had with them. They even inform us of their appearance, and sometimes describe their clothing. But do they ever in-

timate that any one ever saw the Devil; describe his appearance and clothing, or relate any conversations held with him? It cannot be for want of powers on his part to do all this, for our brethren believe that he can do more remarkable things than any of these. Is he ashamed to show himself among men? We doubt this, for he is believed to be a shameless being. Well, does he conceal himself from men, that he may the more effectually accomplish his wicked designs against them? We doubt this also, for it is affirmed by his advocates that he can assume a very fascinating form, yea, transform himself into an angel of light, the more effectually to deceive. How, then, do our orthodox brethren account for it, that no sacred writer says any one ever saw the Devil, or conversed with him? We are aware that they may object by saying, "Did he not assume the likeness of a serpent in Eden, and did he not converse with Eve?" But, brethren, we have shown, Section II., that this is a mistaken view of Gen. 3. You will, perhaps, object again by saying, "Did not Satan make a personal appearance among the sons of God, as stated in the first and second chapters of Job, and is not his conversation distinctly related?" We answer, Yes; but can you disprove the evidence which has been adduced, that Satan was not a real being, but only the imaginary evil god of the Magians? If you can, and will, we shall feel greatly indebted to you. But, perhaps, you will object again by saying, "Did not the Devil appear to the Saviour, and hold a conversation with him?" Answer: Did you ever notice, that neither in the first two chapters of Job, nor in the account of our Lord's temptation, is anything said about any form, color, or shape, which Satan assumed? Nor in either of these cases are the conversations represented as held by him with sinful men. Besides, in considering these accounts, we think it has been shown that no such being was intended by the writers. Do you object further, by saying, "Are we not told that Satan transformed himself into an angel of light; and is he not

represented, in the book of Revelation, under the form of a great red dragon?" Yes; and you might add, "having seven heads, and ten horns, and crowns on his heads;" yea, as having a pretty long tail, which could sweep from the firmament "a third part of the stars, and cast them to the earth." But, brethren, is it correct to assume as true that the Devil is a fallen angel, and then recur to the symbolical language of Scripture for proof, which proof, when adduced, renders your doctrine ridiculous? Besides, have we not shown that such passages have no relation to such a subject? Is it still objected, "Does not the history of the world, since revelation was completed, furnish accounts of the Devil appearing to men in various forms, conversing with them, and carrying off soul and body from this world at the time agreed upon by those who had sold themselves to him?" Yes, verily such stories have been told. But if any minister among us should preach such nonsense to the people, he might be looking out for another parish, in some other quarter of the globe. If any man among us should seriously say he had seen the Devil, and conversed with him, his friends would soon procure a place for him in the insane hospital. Do our orthodox friends believe such childish stories themselves? They would smile at me if I even suggested that they had any faith in them; still, however, they continue to preach that an angel fell from heaven, has ruined the whole human race, deceives them, walks about seeking whom he may devour, and that he will be the eternal tormentor of a considerable portion of them. Yet no person has ever seen him or conversed with him. Surely it is fair to infer that the Scriptures do not teach his existence.

3d. If an angel fell from heaven before the sin of our first parents, how do our orthodox brethren account for the fact, that the Jews, to whom were committed the oracles of God, were obliged to go to Babylon to get the information? Moses says nothing of it, nor does he deliver any injunctions to Israel concerning a fallen angel. Nor

until after the Babylonish captivity, does it appear that such a being was known in Judea, except as an evil god among the heathen nations. We would ask our brethren, affectionately, how they account for this, if their views of the Devil are drawn from divine revelation?

4th. It is a notorious fact, not easily accounted for on scripture ground, that people in these days make very different uses of the terms devil and satan from what were made in the days of the inspired writers. I shall give an example or two of what I mean. First, you never find in those days, as in these, persons apologizing for crimes by blaming the Devil. Nor do you find that any one ever made the Devil a bugbear for the purpose of frightening their children into obedience. Nor does the Devil appear to have been any object of fear to old or young, by night or by day. Besides, though men in ancient times, as in these, were given to cursing and swearing, yet you do not find that any of them had learned to swear by the Devil. An instance is not on record, of one, in a passion or otherwise, who ever wished any of his fellow-creatures to go to hell or the Devil. In old times, people swore by the name of the Lord, and cursed each other by their gods; but no one seems to have known how to swear by the Devil. And it is equally certain that no inspired writer knew how to give such horrible descriptions of the Devil and hell torments as are frequently given by modern preachers. But it is well known that many damn their hearers to endless hell torments, and send them without much ceremony to the Devil; and is it any matter of surprise that their hearers, in a less genteel way, should do the same? So long as we have so much unscriptural, not to say profane, talk about the Devil and hell torments in the pulpit, let us cease to wonder that similar profane, silly language should salute our ears almost at every corner of the streets.

5th. The Old Testament is often quoted in the New, and quoted to show what was the faith of believers during that dispensation, but is never quoted or alluded

to, showing that any of them believed the Devil to be a fallen angel. It is neither announced as an Old Testament doctrine, nor as a new revelation from God under the gospel dispensation. Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness; but it is not said of any one, that he believed in a fallen angel, called the Devil, and that this was of use to him in any way. We have seen that both Old and New Testament writers frequently speak of Satan and the Devil; and we appeal to the candor of our brethren to say, whether the scripture writers would have applied these terms to good and bad men, to the angel of Jehovah, to men's evil passions, and to a piece of writing, had they considered them appropriate titles of the worst being in the universe, and the implacable enemy of God and man?

6th. It is a fact, that, in every country where the Bible is not known, or not studied where it is known, superstitious notions have prevailed concerning witches, evil spirits, ghosts, and the Devil; and just in proportion as it has been known and studied, all such superstitions have gradually been exploded and renounced by the people. For example, not many centuries ago it was firmly believed, by all the Christian world, that human beings could become witches and wizards. It was also believed that they were in league with the Devil, and could perform very extraordinary things. See Mather's Magnalia. When the tragical scenes of the Salem witchcraft occurred, the man who would have written against it, as I do now against the Devil, would have been an object of universal execration. But I doubt if you can find in the town of Salem an intelligent man who has the least faith in the doctrine of witchcraft. Even the Devil himself now, with all his extraordinary powers, does not excite one half the attention which a few witches did in those days. Let him muster all the priestcraft and superstition left in the land to his assistance, he could not procure a jury of twelve men to condemn a single individual to death for being in league

with him. It was a dark day for the Devil when witchcraft declined; for from that hour his popularity has been on the wane, it being one of his chief supports. Now people are as much puzzled to explain how a human being could become a witch or a wizard, as how a holy angel in heaven could become a devil. But while people are generally agreed that witchcraft was all a piece of superstition, and do justice to the Devil in freeing him from all blame about it, they still continue to believe in his existence and extraordinary powers. We look back with surprise to the days when our fathers burned the witches, and throw the mantle of charity over them. Our children will have to do the same for us a century hence. They will say, "Strange that our fathers should declare witchcraft all a piece of superstition, and yet not see that the existence of the Devil was no better. The Devil never performed such wonders as witches have done. Did he ever bring a good man from the state of the dead to converse with the living, as did the witch of Endor? Strange, beyond measure strange, that our fathers should so completely discard witchcraft as a superstition which the Jews imbibed from the Canaanites, where no Devil was known, and yet continue to believe in the Devil, a superstition which the Jews imbibed at Babylon many ages after." Thus will our children be surprised at our superstition and weakness, and will have to cover us with the mantle of their charity, for our belief in the personality of the Devil, as we do that of our fathers respecting witches.

That a great revolution of opinion has taken place about witches, ghosts, &c., no one can deny. Well, how has it been effected? Not by force, but by the slow, gradual influence of the light of truth. The Bible has been more read and critically examined. Reason and common sense, formerly degraded, assume their proper place and dignity. The arts and sciences have been cultivated, and the means of human knowledge greatly increased. Witchcraft, like the owl, has fled before light,

and no place is found for it in this country. So will it be, and so let it be, until every superstition is banished from the earth.

7th. It is also a fact that the common opinions entertained of the Devil are at variance with other plain and acknowledged truths of the Bible. I shall only give an example or two of this. The Devil is generally accused of tempting men to sin. But when the Scriptures speak in plain language, they inform us that men tempt each other to sin, Prov. 1 : 10. And that every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed, James 1 : 14, and 4 : 1—4. In the popular language of the times, Judas' crimes are ascribed to the Devil. But they are also ascribed to himself, Acts 1 : 18—26. Judas takes all the blame to himself: "I have betrayed the innocent blood." By consulting the following texts, it may be seen that things are sometimes ascribed to the Devil, to God, and to men. Luke 22 : 3; John 13 : 2, 27, 30; Acts 2 : 23; 2 Sam. 14 : 1; 1 Chron. 21 : 1; 1 Kings 22 : 22, 23; James 1 : 13, 14; Jer. 4 : 10; Ezek. 14 : 9; Compare 2 Thess. 2 : 8—12; 1 John 3 : 8; Gen. 45 : 6—8; 42 : 21, 22; Acts 5 : 3, and 4 : 9. It is generally asserted that the Devil is the secret agent in tempting men, and that he makes tools of them; but this is taking that for granted which ought to be proved true, for the Scripture nowhere asserts this.

8th. It is also a fact that men, in sinning, are never conscious of the influence of the Devil over them. They have learned to say that the Devil influences men to sin, and sometimes blame the Devil for their crimes; but the personal consciousness and experience of every man declare that no such influence was felt, nor was it needed. An evil influence is felt, but it is the influence of our own lusts and passions, drawing us away and enticing us. The scripture devil does tempt us, but not a fallen angel, as is commonly believed.

9th. It is also a fact, that the common opinions entertained of the Devil, whether right or wrong, are the

effects of early education and popular opinion. With most people, reason, common sense, and the Bible, had nothing to do in forming such opinions, but they have been implicitly received by tradition from their fathers. They say they believe them, but cannot tell why, except that they were so taught; for they have never exercised their reason or studied the Bible to see whether they are true or false. Even when a person determines to examine such opinions, early prejudices and popular opinion deter him from giving free scope to his investigations. We speak here from experience, for these have been powerfully felt in the course of this discussion.

10th. The last fact which I shall mention is, that allowing the personal existence of the Devil fully proved, it is beyond all doubt that he has been much misrepresented, and his character abused by many Christian people. I shall only give an instance or two. For many ages he was accused of making witches and wizards. Now it is allowed no such beings ever existed, but the whole was a piece of superstition and an astonishing instance of human credulity. Again; for ages, what frightful descriptions have been given of the Devil, in preaching! He has been accused as being the tormentor of damned souls in hell, and imagination has been put to the utmost stretch to describe his horrible modes of torture there. Now, not a word of this is true, for — let the Devil have his due—no scripture writer ever says a word about the Devil as the tormentor of any one. In fact, many a railing, not to say wicked, accusation has been brought against the Devil; and though this is now allowed to be true, no apology is made for such shameful, unscriptural defamation. We readily excuse all this, for though preachers have declaimed against such a being in the pulpit, and terrified people with such horrible descriptions of him, all must have seen that they had no great faith in their own doctrine. They, like other people, live all the six days of the week without any concern about him. The minister makes him a bugbear

in the pulpit to frighten the parents, and parents at home make the same use of him to frighten their children; but both take care not to be much frightened themselves.

SECTION X.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

THE objections which have occurred to me against the views advanced, I shall fairly state, and attempt to answer. It may, then, be objected —

1st. "The Devil, Satan, or Tempter, is spoken of as a real being. Personal pronouns are not only used in speaking of him, but he is represented as speaking and acting, and we are expressly informed of what he said and did." This objection has been partially adverted to in the course of our remarks, but I shall here notice it a little further. If all to which personal pronouns are applied are to be considered real beings, we must admit many inanimate things, yea, qualities, to be real beings as well as the Devil. For example, the earth or land is personified. Job 31: 38. The heavens are also personified. Jer. 2: 12, 13. So is the sea. Job 38: 8, 9. Death, the grave, and destruction, are personified. Job 28: 22; 1 Cor. 15: 55. The hosts of heaven are personified. Psalm 148: 1—5. See the whole Psalm. The mountains and hills can sing, and all the trees of the field can clap their hands. Isai. 55: 12. Wisdom, power, and a variety of good qualities, are personified in Scripture, and why not also bad qualities, yea, the principle of evil itself? In short, if things represented as speaking and acting must be considered as real beings, then it is certain all inanimate things ought to be considered real beings, for almost all things are represented as living, and speaking, and acting. Jotham's olive-tree, fig-tree, vine, and bramble, must be considered living beings, for they

are represented as holding a conversation together. Judg. 9: 7—16. Micaiah's speech to Ahab, 1 Kings 22, must also be literally understood; and who does not perceive what absurdities would ensue, if such a mode of interpretation was adopted?

2d. "If there be no foundation in Scripture for a fallen angel, called the Devil, how came this opinion to obtain such universal currency among mankind? The opinion, you say, was held by the Magians, and this evil being was considered their evil god, and called Ahraman, and by the Greeks Arimanius. Zoroaster called him 'an angel of darkness,' and other nations have had various other names for him. Now, as all counterfeit money implies current, must there not be a foundation in truth for such a universal belief of an evil being, call him Devil, Satan, or by any other name?" As this is the principal, and most popular, objection which can be advanced against my views, I shall spend some time in considering it. It is true that counterfeit money implies current; but do our orthodox friends believe that counterfeit opinions in religion always imply that there is some foundation in Scripture for them? Do they allow that there is some foundation in truth for a purgatory and the doctrine of transubstantiation? Do they believe that there is any foundation in truth for witchcraft, for ghosts, and all the different grades of hobgoblins? Will they allow that there is a foundation in Scripture for all the wild and ridiculous opinions which have obtained currency in the world? If not, why assert that there must be for the common opinion concerning the Devil? Is it not possible to invent a thousand things which have no foundation in the Bible? Error supposes truth, as counterfeit money supposes current; but must we say that every error is a corruption of truth? It ought to be noticed, that Dean Prideaux did not consider the articles of Zoroaster's creed, quoted Section IV., as corruptions of truth, but consonant to the truth. Nor do Christians in our day, for they have adopted both the sentiments and language

of his creed. Why then call them corruptions of the truth? If they are, why preach such corruptions for truth to the world? Do orthodox preachers tell the people that such sentiments are greatly corrupted, both as to matter and language? On the contrary, do they not solemnly assure their hearers that such doctrines are the faithful sayings of God, though it is notorious Zoroaster taught them six hundred years before the days of Christ? Will they thank me for suggesting that there is any corruption in the case? If they believe such opinions have any corruption about them, why not purge them, and preach only the unadulterated truth of God? Why pass as current Bible doctrine such counterfeit opinions on the public? Although there is no law to punish men for passing counterfeit opinions in religion, yet one would think their own doctrine of eternal misery, if they believed it, would be sufficient to deter them.

If the universal belief in a Devil proves that there is a foundation in truth for the opinion, then Paganism, Mahometanism, and Roman Catholicism, have all a foundation in truth, for they have all, in their turn, been pretty universally believed. Purgatory, transubstantiation. witchcraft, and a thousand other opiniens, ought not to be discarded, for they were once generally believed. Many good and learned men believed them, and thought their proofs for them as good as those now adduced concerning the Devil. Why are they rejected? Because attention to the Bible has shown they are not taught there; and closer attention to it will show, also, that the common opinions concerning the Devil are equally false. But if the above objection has any real force, or the reasoning employed is correct, our orthodox friends must allow that universal salvation may have some foundation in Scripture, for it has been believed for centuries, and if it should ever be universally received it would then be wholly true.

How such an opinion, as that concerning an evil being called the Devil, came first to exist among men, has been

partly accounted for in Sections III. and IV. Christians learned this opinion from the Jews, the Jews learned it from Zoroaster's creed, and Zoroaster learned it from the ancient Magian religion. It may be asked, How came the Magians by such an opinion? I would first answer this question by asking another. How came the Sabians to worship idols? Was there any foundation in Scripture for this? But the apostle shows, Rom. 1, how all such deviations from truth originated. Men, when they knew God, glorified him not as God; they became vain in their imaginations, their foolish heart was darkened; and, professing themselves to be wise, they became fools. See verses 21, 22, 23. Respecting the origin of an evil principle, which was afterwards personified and deified, Essenus thus writes, p. 125: "Plutarch observes, that the doctrine of two contrary principles prevailed in all countries. The reason is obvious; evil abounded in every age and nation; and, as men could not reconcile the notion of natural and moral evil with an all-wise and benevolent author, it was natural for them to reason in the following manner: 'Since nothing can come into being without a cause, and since that which is perfectly good cannot be the cause of evil, then there must exist a distinct principle in nature, as well for the production of evil as of that which is good.' In this manner argued the Persian sages; and Plutarch seems to have considered the argument conclusive. This doctrine was introduced into Judea before the age of Isaiah, who, as we have seen, thus sets it aside: 'I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil: I the Lord do all these things.' 45: 7."

3d. It may also be objected, "You have said that the doctrine of an evil principle deified was known as early as the days of Job, which was about the time of Moses; but is not this too early a date for the existence of such an opinion among men, and is there any proof that it existed at such a date?" Some notice was taken of this objection, Section III., and I shall here add a few re-

marks in reply to it. It is then certain that the worship of idols prevailed in the world before the days of Moses. If the question is examined, Did the worship of idols or that of an evil principle first prevail? we think the evidence will be in favor of the latter. But we have found it impossible to ascertain dates as to the first origin of either, both being lost in antiquity. Essenus, quoting from Plutarch, says, page 74: "'There are others again who call the good principle only, God, giving the name of Demon to the evil being; in which number is Zoroaster, the Magian, who is said to have lived 5000 years before the Trojan war. Now, this philosopher calls the good principle Oromazes, and the evil one Arimanius; adding, moreover, that, as of all sensible beings, the former bears the greatest resemblance to light, so the latter was most like darkness.' § xlv. 40. The doctrine here stated is undoubtedly very ancient; but the earliness of the period in which Zoroaster is said to have lived is absurd, and must have proceeded from that propensity, in which all nations indulged, to magnify their own antiquity." Further; Mr. Mayo, in his Ancient Geography, says, p. 37, "The Scythians, whom the dawn of history discovers in present Persia, under their king Tanus, attack Vexores, king of Egypt, conquer Asia, and establish the Scythian empire, fifteen hundred years before Ninus, or three thousand six hundred and sixty years before Christ." And, quoting from Mr. Pinkerton concerning "the aboriginal Scythian empire of Persia," he thus writes, p. 23: "And beyond this there is no memorial of human affairs, save in Egypt alone, the history of which begins with Menes, the first king, about four thousand years before our era; while the earliest appearance of the Scythians in history is about four hundred years after, when Vexores was king of Egypt, and Tanus of the Scythæ — not to mention the collateral light derived from the whole history of the Greeks and Romans, who were Scythæ, as just shown." He adds, on the same page: "On this route we shall find the Scythians, Ge-

tæ, or Goths, not only peopling all Scandinavia and Germany, but extending hence, and actually possessing Gaul and Spain five hundred years before Christ, as well as Britain and Ireland three hundred years before Christ." From these statements the following things are obvious:

1st. That the Magian religion is very ancient, extending so far back into antiquity that no distinct account of its origin is to be found on record. If such a thing is in existence we have been unable to find it. 2d. That the people to whom the Christian religion was first preached, from the very nature of the case, must have been previously imbued with the tenets of the Magian religion. It was preached first to the Jews, who had spent seventy years in captivity at Babylon, where we have seen that the Magian religion prevailed. It was also preached by the apostles to the Greeks and Romans, whom Mr. Mayo says "were Scythians," and "whom the dawn of history discovers in present Persia," the very place where Prideaux, above quoted, says the Magian religion first originated. 3d. Mr. Mayo's statements also show us how the tenets of the Magian religion were diffused throughout Europe. He says, "The Scythians, whom the dawn of history discovers in present Persia," we shall find, "not only peopling all Scandinavia and Germany, but extending hence, and actually possessing Gaul and Spain five hundred years before Christ, as well as Britain and Ireland three hundred years before Christ." The Magian religion being the ancient religion of Persia when the people from thence overran Scandinavia, Germany, Gaul, Spain, Britain, and Ireland, several hundred years before Christ, they must have carried its principles along with them. A miracle was necessary to prevent Christianity being blended with them when introduced into those countries. That it has been blended with them we think is proved in the preceding sections.

We have, then, all the evidence which the nature of the case will admit, that the doctrine of an evil principle

deified was known among men in the days of Job. If our orthodox brethren deny this, and can prove that their Devil had another or better origin, we respectfully request them to do it.

Such are the chief objections which are likely to be made against my views of the Devil, excepting such as might be made against any innovation in religious popular opinions. But as these have been stated and answered in my Inquiry into the Words Sheol, Hades, &c., to it I refer the reader. In concluding this section I would merely remark, that many have good reason to object against my views; for, if they are true, what a great loss they must sustain in being robbed of their principal topics of preaching and religious conversation! The Devil and eternal hell torments are themes on which many delight to dwell. They seem health to their navel and marrow to their bones, and to remove these is taking away their gods; and what have they more?

SECTION XI.

CONCLUDING REMARKS, POINTING OUT SOME OF THE EVILS WHICH HAVE ARISEN FROM THE COMMON OPINIONS ENTERTAINED OF THE DEVIL AND SATAN.

It would be an endless task to detail all the evils which have resulted from the common opinions entertained of the Devil. A few only I shall name, and leave the reader to pursue the subject. If it then be true, as I have attempted to show, that no such being as the Devil exists, let the reader consider—

1st. What a vast number of passages in God's word have been perverted in proof of this doctrine. Is there no evil in misunderstanding and perverting God's word? No man will say so who loves and reveres it. Misconceptions of it have been the fruitful source of most evils

which have existed in the Christian world. A great change is produced on the whole face of the Bible by denying this doctrine.

2d. Let the reader consider the evil effects of this doctrine on mankind. A belief in the common opinions concerning the Devil has laid the foundation for almost every other superstition among Christians. Take into view, also, what unnecessary and distressing fears the belief has given to children, and even persons of riper years. And who can tell the distress which they have given people when closing their mortal career? On weak minds their influence has been such as to drive some to madness, and others to suicide. Most people would dismiss a domestic, if found frightening their children with ghosts and hobgoblins; but these same people cheerfully pay a man to frighten both them and their children, one day in the week, with the Devil. The Devil, with many people, is much more feared than God. But what an excellent apology have such opinions afforded men for their sins! The Devil has been obliged to bear the blame, while men have had all the pleasure of sinning. By such opinions, men's attention has been turned away from the true devil within them, to an invisible being, who exists independent of them. While a deceived heart has been drawing them aside from truth and holiness, the doctrine of the Devil helps to calm their fears, stupefy their conscience, and embolden them to repeat their crimes. And why should it not, if it be true that such a powerful, deceitful being as the Devil is continually influencing them to sin?

3d. The common opinions concerning the Devil are highly dishonorable to the character of God. We have never seen the least attempt made to show how such a being as the Devil was for the honor of God's character. If any man can explain how the Devil can be for the honor of God, either here or hereafter, we should be glad to see it done. How such a being, with such extraordinary powers, with this world for his range of wickedness,

and existing forever, the enemy of God and the tormentor of men, can be for the honor of Jehovah's character, is beyond all my feeble powers to comprehend. It seems to argue that God could not, or would not, prevent his existence; that he cannot, or will not, curtail his powers, confine him, restore him, or strike him out of existence. This evil, once introduced, is without remedy and without end. It is certainly a poor account of God to tell us that the glory and honor of his character are inseparable from the Devil, and that the eternal misery of this being, with multitudes of mankind, is to promote the glory of God forever. If this be glory and honor, pray what is dishonor or disgrace?

4th. The common opinions concerning the Devil and Satan, with others generally held, have led to downright infidelity. Is it any matter of surprise that men become infidels, when such opinions are presented to them as the religion of Jesus Christ? Is it not rather matter of wonder that all men are not infidels? Cast your eyes round the whole world, and say if infidelity has not had its hot-bed in the countries where such absurd and ridiculous opinions have been palmed on the world for religion by interested priests. Neither infidelity nor idolatry can be conquered or prevented but by the truth of God.

5th. Such opinions mixed with the religion of Jesus Christ have been in time past, and must be while they are retained, a great hindrance to the universal reception of Christianity. It is a question of no ordinary kind to a reflecting mind, Is the religion of Jesus Christ presented to the heathen in its pure unadulterated state? Or are we introducing to them a human creed, containing articles derived from Zoroaster and the Grecian philosophy, and only supplanting one system of ignorance, superstition, and cruelty, by establishing another in some respects worse? Viewing the creeds taught the heathen generally, let us see if this is saying anything but the truth. Christian missionaries teach only one God, but

this God they divide into three. But passing this, I ask, what heathen god ever called on its votaries to believe that he had elected some to everlasting happiness before they were born, and had left, not to say doomed, all the rest to endless misery? Heathen gods have required parents to sacrifice their children to them, women to immolate themselves on the funeral piles of their husbands, and hecatombs of old and young have been slaughtered to appease their wrath; but name the heathen god, if you can, that ever required its worshippers to be willing to be damned in order that he might save them! And, when did any of them ever teach their worshippers that their happiness in heaven will be greatly increased by the sight of their nearest and dearest relatives writhing under eternal torments? I call on our orthodox brethren to name the heathen god, who ever taught such doctrines, or ever bore such a cruel, horrible character; and to crown the climax of his nameless wickedness said, "All this was done for the display of his glorious character." Who would be a Christian if this be the Christian's God? Who would not be a Pagan to get rid of such a God?

Is it said, "Missionaries do not teach such things to the heathen?" It will certainly afford me pleasure to find that they do not. But did they not teach such things here, before they went far hence unto the Gentiles? If they taught them here, why not there? Presuming, then, that such doctrines are taught to the heathen, permit me to ask what an intelligent heathen might be expected to say to such missionaries? He might surely with great propriety say something like the following: "Gentlemen Missionaries—you have been at some trouble, and considerable expense, in coming here to teach us about your God and religion. While we thank you for your good intentions, we must say that we cannot change our own gods for yours, or add one more to the gods we have already, unless he is a good, kind, and merciful God. Our own gods are cruel enough, but

if your God be as you describe him, to receive him as our God would only be to add to our miserable condition. We have had all the tender feelings of our hearts torn to pieces, in seeing our infants and relations tortured to death to satisfy our present gods. But, bad as they are, none of them ever made such cruel demands on us as yours do on you. No, none of them ever demanded of us to believe that our eternal felicity would be increased by beholding others in misery, and that we ourselves must be willing to be damned for their glory, or we never can be saved by them. You have come a great way to tell us that all our gods are but dumb idols. Perhaps this may be true; but unless you suppose us heathen, devoid of all feeling and common sense, how could you ever suppose that we would renounce our earthly, cruel false gods, for an eternally cruel one? Return to your employers, with our thanks for their good intentions towards us; and when we send missionaries to your country, they shall bring you thousands of gods all better than the one you propose to us. Bad as our gods are, none of them, like yours, allows a devil to ruin us here, and torment us forever in the world to come. Our fathers knew about your Devil, and you have borrowed a considerable part of your creed from what they were taught many years before your religion existed; and yet you come to tell us things, which we knew long before, as wonderful revelations from your God. Whether your impudence is not as great as you think our ignorance to be, you may consider on your passage home. Fare you well."

To conclude. If we wish the heathen to cast their idols to the moles and to the bats, let us cast our Devil and many other false opinions out of the Christian religion, and let us both say, What have we any more to do with idols, or with the Devil? The Lord, he is our God, and we will serve him.

APPENDIX TO PART FIRST.

The following texts, generally supposed to teach the popular doctrine of the fall of angels, are not examined in the foregoing pages: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast *them* down to hell, and delivered *them* into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." 2 Peter 2: 4. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." Jude 6. The reason they were not considered, was, doubtless, the fact that the author had very fully discussed them in his First Inquiry, to which we refer the reader. It may not be improper to present, in addition to what is there said, the light supposed to be thrown upon the texts by the Book of Enoch. Rev. Thos. J. Sawyer, D. D., in an article published in the Universalist Quarterly, Vol. 1, has shown, very conclusively, that both Peter and Jude referred to the tradition of that book; and used it, not to recognize its truth, but to show from generally received opinions that God would certainly punish the wicked. By a reference to the connection in which the texts are found, it will be seen that both the apostles were endeavoring to show, from examples existing in history or tradition, God's method of dealing with the ungodly. Peter uses the following examples. After having referred to the false teachers who were privily bringing in damnable heresies, and said that their judgment lingered not, and their damnation slumbered not, he proceeds, by saying: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment; and spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly; and turning the cities of Sodom

and Gomorrah into ashes, condemned them with an overthrow, making them an example unto those that after should live ungodly; and delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked (for that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed his righteous soul from day to day with their unlawful deeds); the Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." 2 Peter 2: 4—9. Here the fate of the apostate angels, the old world, and the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, is used to show the method of God's government, and the certainty that judgment would overtake the false teachers. Jude's course is the same; he illustrates by examples the doctrine he is seeking to enforce. "I will, therefore, put you in remembrance, though ye once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not. And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. Likewise, also, these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities. Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil (he disputed about the body of Moses), durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee. But these speak evil of those things which they know not; but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core." vs. 5—11.

It is not necessary to suppose that the apostles intended to endorse the truth of all the history and tradition from which their cases were selected; if the examples cited were generally believed, they answered the purpose in view. With these facts in mind, the reader will derive much help from the book to which we have referred. Dr. Sawyer says: —

"But there is one work of a still earlier date than either

Josephus or Philo, and which is of the highest importance on the subject of our present inquiries. I mean the *Book of Enoch*. This book is very remarkable, both for its contents and its history. It was written by some foreign Jew, probably before the Christian era, and was often mentioned by the early Christian fathers. After the eighth or ninth century it was lost to the Europeans, and was not regained till the latter part of the last century, when it was found by James Bruce, the English traveller, in Abyssinia. Three copies, in Ethiopic,* were brought by him to Europe; one of which he retained, one he presented to the Royal Library of Paris, and the third he gave to the Bodleian Library at Oxford. That of Oxford has been translated into the English language by Dr. Richard Lawrence, late professor of Hebrew in that University, and now Archbishop of Cashel; and from this a translation has been made into German, by Dr. Hoffmann, of Jener.†

"Respecting the age of this remarkable book, there is little diversity of opinion. Dr. Lawrence and Dr. Hoffmann agree in dating its composition at thirty or forty years before Christ; that is, in the early part of the reign of Herod. Professor Stuart says it must have been written subsequent to Herod's reign; and Professor Luecke, of Gottingen, sets it down as having been composed subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem; in which opinion substantially agrees Professor Nitzsch, of Bonn. But whether they date it thus earlier or later, they all agree, I believe, in the opinion that it was written before the epistle of St. Jude.‡ Nay, further, it is generally believed that this apostle actually quoted from the book of Enoch.§ Not only the moderns are forced to this opinion, but it seems to have been universally adopted by the an-

* It is found in the Ethiopic Bible, holding its place before the book of Job.

† Dr. Hoffmann's translation, with notes and explanations, has been published in two volumes, the first of which appeared at Jener, in 1833, and the last in 1838.

‡ The date of this epistle is uncertain, some placing it as early as the year 65, and others — Mill, for instance — as late as 90. The date generally assigned it is about 70 or 72.

§ Jude, verses 14, 15. The passage in the book of Enoch reads thus: "Behold, he comes with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon them and destroy the wicked, and reprove all the carnal for everything which the sinful and ungodly have done and committed against him."

cients. 'Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Anatolius (Alexand.) and Hilary,' says Professor Stuart,* 'all of whom refer to the book before us, and quote from it, say nothing which goes to establish the idea that any Christians of their day denied or doubted that a quotation was made by the apostle Jude from the book of Enoch. Several, and in fact most, fo these writers do, indeed, call in question the *canonical* rank or authority of the book of Enoch; but the apologies which they make for the quotation of it by Jude, show that the quotation itself was, as a matter of fact, generally conceded among them.' There are, it is true, some individuals who still doubt whether Jude quoted the book of Enoch; but while, as Professor Stuart suggests, this doubt is incapable of being confirmed by any satisfactory proof, it avails nothing to deny the quotation; for it is evident, if Jude did not quote the book of Enoch, he did quote a tradition of no better authority."†

Dr. Sawyer next shows that the book contains a particular account of the fall of the angels, and that Peter and Jude took their examples from it. The want of room forbids my giving all his statements and quotations, and I must be content with presenting those that bear directly upon the question. From chap. 7 he quotes the following:

"It happened, after the sons of men had multiplied in those days, that daughters were born unto them, elegant and beautiful. And when the angels, the sons of heaven, beheld them, they became enamored of them, saying to each other: Come, let us select for ourselves wives from the progeny of men, and let us beget children. Then their leader, Samyaza, said to them: I fear that you may, perhaps, be indisposed to the performance of this enterprise; and that I alone shall suffer for so grievous a crime. But they answered him and said: We all swear, and bind ourselves by mutual execrations, that we will not change our intentions, but execute our projected undertaking. Then they swore all to-

* Biblical Repository, Jan. 1840. Volume iii. (second series), p. 87.

† J. F. Von Meyer (Ueber das Buch Henoch, in Studien und Kritiken, J. 1841, 3tes Heft), says: "It is certain that Jude explained this prophecy as in itself Enochian, but he cites no book of Enoch." So Horne (Introd. etc.) says: "The language of Jude by no means implies that he quoted from any book whatever."

gether, and all bound themselves by mutual execrations. Their whole number was two hundred, who descended upon Ardis, which is the top of Mount Armon."

After giving extracts showing that giants, whose stature was each three hundred cubits, were the fruit of the union, and that the angels taught men various evils, he says: "Chapter 9 informs us how the angels Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Suryal and Uriel, looked down from heaven, and, seeing what was done, they offered a sort of address to the Almighty, setting forth the conduct of the sinning angels, and the misery brought upon the human race by it."

"Chapter 10," says our author, "carries forward the story, thus: 'Then the Most High, the Great and Holy One, spoke; and sent Arsayalalyur to the son of Lamech, saying: Say to him in my name, Conceal thyself. Then explain to him the consummation which is about to take place; for all the earth shall perish; the waters of a deluge shall come over the whole earth, and all things which are in it shall be destroyed. And now teach him how he may escape, and how his seed may remain in all the earth. Again the Lord said to Raphael: Bind Azazyel* hand and foot; cast him into darkness; and, opening the desert which is in Dudael, cast him in there. Throw upon him hurled and pointed stones, covering him with darkness. There shall he remain forever; cover his face, that he may not see the light. And in the great day of judgment let him be cast into the fire.' Gabriel was sent to destroy 'the children of fornication' from among men, by exciting them one against another that they might perish by mutual slaughter. 'To Michael likewise the Lord said, Go and announce his crime to Samyaza, and to the others who are with him who have been associated with women, that they might be polluted with all their impurity. And when all their sons shall be slain, when they shall see the perdition of their beloved, bind them for seventy generations underneath the earth, even to the day of judgment, and of consummation, until the effect of which shall last forever be completed.'

* It was he who taught men to make swords, knives, breast-plates and mirrors, together with the use of paints, the beautifying of the eyebrows, the use of precious stones, and all sorts of dyes, "so that the world became altered."

"The story goes on: 'I, Enoch, was blessing the Great Lord and King of Peace. And behold, the watchers called me Enoch the scribe. Then the Lord said to me, Enoch, scribe of righteousness, go tell the watchers of heaven, who have deserted the lofty sky, and their holy everlasting station, who have been polluted with women; and have done as the sons of men do, by taking to themselves wives, and who have been greatly corrupted on the earth; that on the earth they shall now obtain peace and remission of sin,' etc. Chapter 13. 'Then Enoch passing on, said to Azazyel: Thou shalt not obtain peace. A great sentence is gone forth against thee. He shall bind thee; neither shall relief, mercy, and supplication be thine, on account of the oppression which thou hast taught; and on account of every act of blasphemy, tyranny and sin, which thou hast discovered to the children of men. Then, departing from him, I spoke to them all together; and they all became terrified and trembled; beseeching me to write for them a memorial of supplication, that they might obtain forgiveness; and that I might make the memorial of their prayer ascend up before the God of heaven; because they could not themselves thenceforward address him, nor raise up their eyes to heaven on account of their disgraceful offence for which they were judged.'

"'Go, say to the watchers of heaven, who have sent thee to pray for them: You ought to pray for men, and not men for you. Wherefore have you forsaken the lofty and holy heaven, which endures forever, and have lain with women; have defiled yourselves with the daughters of men; and have taken to yourselves wives; have acted like the sons of the earth, and have begotten an impious offspring? You, being spiritual, holy, and possessing a life which is eternal, have polluted yourselves with women; have begotten in carnal blood; have lusted in the blood of men; and have done as those who are flesh and blood, &c. These, however, die and perish. Therefore have I given to them wives, that they might cohabit with them; that sons might be born of them; and that this might be transacted upon earth. But you, from the beginning, were made spiritual, possessing a life which is eternal, and not subject to death forever. Therefore, I made not wives for you, because, being spiritual, your dwelling is in heaven. Now

the giants who have been born of spirit and flesh shall be called upon earth evil spirits, and on earth shall be their habitation. Evil spirits shall proceed from their flesh, because they were created from above; from the holy watchers was their beginning and primary foundation. Evil spirits shall they be upon the earth, and the spirits of the wicked shall they be called. The habitation of the spirits of heaven shall be in heaven; but upon earth shall be the habitation of terrestrial spirits, who are born on earth. The spirits of the giants shall be like clouds, which shall oppress, corrupt, fall, contend, and bruise upon earth. They shall cause lamentation. No food shall they eat;* and they shall be thirsty; they shall be concealed and shall not rise up against the sons of men and against women; for they come forth during the days of slaughter and destruction.' "

We will close this appendix with the following from the article.

"It can need no very minute comparison to perceive that the reference made by Peter and Jude to fallen angels, corresponds most accurately, in every particular, to this story in the book of Enoch. But it may be exhibited in a manner to strike the eye at a glance. The reader will observe that the facts set forth by St. Jude respecting the angels, are; 1, That *they kept not their first estate.* 2. That *they left their own habitation.* 3. That *they are reserved in chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.* To this statement St. Peter only adds, 4. The circumstance, *they were cast down to Tartarus*, and confined there.

"1. The angels kept not their *first estate.* The word in the original here is ἀρχὴν, upon the interpretation of which the commentators are not agreed. Some render it their *first state;* some their *original dignity;* and others, better, their *principality.* The first and second interpretations are forced and unnatural, and would never, I am sure, have been thought of, but because the commentators did not well know what else to render it. The word properly means the first, the beginning; the first principles or elements of things; and then, the first officers in the state, proper authority, magistracy,† dominion. These fallen angels are called watchers;

* "M. De Sacy here remarks," says Dr. Laurence, "that the sense seems to require an affirmation instead of a negative clause."

† See Passow's Lexicon.

that is, as I have before remarked, they had some charge assigned them, either over individual men, nations, or parts of the earth. This was properly called their ἀρχήν. When they become enamored of women, they kept not, they neglected this office. Bengel says they kept not* their '*imperium*, statum *semel* eis assignatum;'† but he obviously mistook the reference. The book of Enoch says they deserted their '*holy everlasting station*,' and the whole story shows that instead of attending to the duties of their office, they gave themselves up altogether to vice and crime.

"2. They left their own habitation. They did this, as Bengel well observes, *willingly*. They were not thrust out of heaven, as Milton and most divines dream, but they left it of their own accord. This is the plain meaning of Jude's language, and it is seen at once that it contradicts entirely the whole representation of the fact in the popular theology. But Jude's mode of stating the case corresponds precisely with the story in the book of Enoch. There, as we have seen, the 'dwelling' or habitation of angels, is said to be in heaven; they are reproached with having *deserted the lofty sky*, and *forsaken the lofty and holy heaven*. Laurmann thinks, 'with some reason,' says Dr. Bloomfield, that the phrase 'left their own habitation,' is a metaphor derived from runaway slaves. In other words, that the expression exhibits the fallen angels in the character of deserters, runaways; and such is the character, precisely, in which they are presented in the book of Enoch.

"3. The fallen angels *are kept in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day*. These are almost the very words which we meet in the story before us. Here the angels were all ordered to be bound. '*Bind Azazyel, hand and foot; cast him into darkness;* and, opening the desert of Dudael, cast him in there. Throw upon him hurled and pointed stones, *covering him with darkness*. There shall he remain *forever;* cover his face that he may not see the light; and *in the great day of judg-*

* The word τηρέω carries with it the idea of *having in the eye*, of *watching over, taking care of*. The fallen angels did not watch over, did not take care of the province, or charge, whatever it might be, which had been appointed them.

† Gnomon Nov. Test., in loco.

ment, let him be cast into the fire.' In like manner, Samyaza and the other angels were to be *bound*, '*seventy generations* underneath the earth, even *to the day of judgment*.' Here are several circumstances in which the identity of meaning, and almost of words, is obvious. The *binding forever*, or for *seventy generations*, in the book of Enoch, is equivalent to the *everlasting chains* of Jude. The *darkness* is the same; and *the day of judgment*, or *the judgment of the great day*, are identical. Such correspondencies are not the result of chance.

"4. It may seem to some that the additional circumstance mentioned by Peter, of the angels being *cast down to hell*, or *Tartarus*, as it is in the original, is not so easily to find a parallel in the book of Enoch. True, this book says nothing of hell or Tartarus. Nor is it to be expected here. The author was, as is believed, a foreign Jew, living remote from Palestine, and of course unacquainted with the Greek language. How, then, could he speak of *Tartarus*, which belongs so exclusively to the heathen mythology as never to find a place in either the Septuagint, or the New Testament, if we except this instance; and here, even, it seems to be used in a somewhat unusual or modified sense. Professor Stuart * says the word 'is occasionally employed in the later classic writers for the *under-world* in general, but in such a connection as to show that it is only when writers mean to speak of the whole as a region of gloom, that they call it Tartarus.' And Dr. Bloomfield† says that Tartarus is a part of *Hades*, 'in which criminals are supposed to be confined till the day of judgment. Now they (the fallen angels) are not represented as being in actual torments, but only *adjudged* to them.' Taken in this sense, it is readily seen that being *cast down to Tartarus*, in Peter, expresses precisely what the author of the book of Enoch calls being bound *underneath the earth*, or, as Professor Stuart would call it, in the *under-world*.

It needs no argument to convince any man acquainted with the laws of language, that these various correspondencies, so numer-

* Essays on Future Punishment, p. 137.

† Greek Test. with Eng. notes, etc., in loco. See also on the subject of Tartarus a vast amount of learned and curious matter in a small tract "de Vita Functorum Statu." By J. Windel, M. D., London, 1663.

ous and so accurate, can be the result of no mere accident. It seems to me quite impossible that any serious doubt should remain that the apostles referred, in all they say of fallen angels, to the story we have now been considering. But, without dwelling longer on this part of the proof, I shall call the attention of my readers to another circumstance, which I cannot but regard as decisive. I allude to the fact that St. Jude clearly indicates the specific character of the crime of which the fallen angels were guilty, and the very crime, let me add, which stands out so prominently in the story of their fall in the book of Enoch. True this does not appear in our English version, the translators of which entirely dropped an important word, and thus completely marred the sense, as well as the sentence. The apostle's language, when faithfully exhibited, and the reference of the relative words clearly indicated, as they are in the original, is this: 'The angels who kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he (God) hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day; even as Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them (that is, about Sodom and Gomorrah) in like manner TO THESE (that is, to the fallen angels), giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.' Most English commentators pass over the word τουτοις, TO THESE, without a notice. The few who do observe it, attempt to explain it, as does Dr. Bloomfield,* as referring — by a figure, which, looking only at the sense, disregards the construction — to the *inhabitants* of Sodom and Gomorrah. It is obvious that this is a device rather unworthy of eminent scholarship and a good cause, and would never have been introduced, but because, if the passage were interpreted according to the construction, it would give a sense inconsistent with the popular doctrine of angelic apostasy. Such a method of interpretation, however, is never to be admitted except in cases of absolute necessity. There is no such necessity in the case before us. Nay, more, the construction is perfectly simple and plain, and utterly forbids the forced interpretation which some would put upon it. It is obvious that τούτοις is masculine

* See also Wolfii Curae Philolog, et Crit., in loco.

here, and can grammatically refer to nothing in the whole sentence but αγγέλοις, above. That it cannot refer to Sodom and Gomorrah, or their inhabitants, is plain, because Sodom and Gomorrah, already used figuratively for their *inhabitants*, take their pronoun in the feminine gender. But, finally, St. Jude clearly uses 'Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them,' as one term; and considering their inhabitants all of one character, compares them all to certain other persons or beings who exhibited a like disposition to the vices of 'fornication and going after strange flesh.' He who will read the story of the fallen angels as it is given in the book of Enoch, will see at a glance that this was specifically their crime. They not only multiplied fornication, but literally went after 'strange flesh,'—another race of beings. 'Thus it appears,' says the Rev. Mr. Faber,* 'when the entire sentence is faithfully exhibited, that the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah and the neighboring cities are compared, in point of the nature of their specific criminality, to certain persons, whom St. Jude styles ANGELI (angels). Hence it is manifest that these ANGELI (angels) must have been guilty of the very same abominations as those which pulled down the righteous vengeance of heaven on the cities of the plain.' It is singular that while Mr. Faber saw so much of the truth, he should still have come to a conclusion so utterly false; for he thinks the fact that the angels were polluted with *corporeal* sins, decisive proof that they could not have been those evil *spirits*, the fallen angels; a conclusion just the reverse of the truth."

In conclusion, let me again remind the reader, that Peter and Jude used the account of the fallen angels with other illustrations to show that God judges the wicked; their use of it is merely historic, and, therefore, we are under no obligation to defend the history, or reconcile the case employed with acknowledged principles. A groundless tradition, if generally believed, as in the case where Michael contended with the devil about the body of Moses, answered the purpose of the apostles as well as any historic truth. O. A. S.

* Treatise on the Patriarchal, Levitical and Christian Dispensations-vol. i., p. 352.

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY

ON

OLIM, AION AND AIONIOS.

OLIM, Aion and Aionios, whose meaning is discussed in the second part of this volume, are supposed by many Christians to be conclusive proof that misery is endless. They admit, however, that the words are often used in the Bible in a limited sense. This admission is a circumstance of no small importance; for if the words are frequently employed to denote a limited period, they cannot, in themselves considered, be positive proof that suffering is endless; and if in any case they afford such proof, it is not from the natural force of the words, but from the circumstances under which they occur. *Olim* being used in the Old Testament, and in only one text (Dan. 12 : 2), supposed to teach the endless duration of punishment, it is not necessary to offer any criticism upon it, especially as the text has been fully considered by Mr. Balfour. It will be sufficient to quote the definition given in the "New Hebrew English Lexicon," published in London, A. D. 1844. In that reliable work, *olim* is thus defined. 1. *Antiquity;* 2. *Eternity;* 3. *Duration of the creation;* 4. *Whole life;* 5. *Unlimited future time.*

Aion and *aionios* have been defined essentially in the same manner. Phavorinus says, it means *life, existence, eternity;* Grove, eternity, an age, life, duration or continuance of time, a revolution of ages, a dispensation of Providence, this world or life, the world or life to come; Parkhurst, always being, duration or continuance of time, but with great variety. He then gives seven senses in which it is used, two signifying eternity, and five a limited period. Jones says, it means everlasting ages, eternity, a

period of time, age, life, the present world, the Jewish dispensation; Donnegan, time, space of time, lifetime; Odyss. 5, 152 and 160, life; Iliad, 22, 58, Hes. Suet. 331, the ordinary period of man's life; Homer and Pindar, frequently the age of man, man's estate; Iliad, 24, 725, a long period of time, eternity. Schweighaeuser defines it to mean, age, life; Valpey, age, length of time; Hincks, a period of time, life, an age, the world, eternity; Hedericus, age, eternity; Pickering, age, a long period of time, indefinite duration, time whether longer or shorter, past, present or future; and Schrevelius, age, world, life.

From these authorities, we are fully justified in saying that *aion* is a word of ambiguous import, and therefore, of itself, it can afford no proof of endless punishment; for when its meaning is endless, it must be in consequence of the manner in which it is used. The same is true of *aionios*. All allow that no adjective can signify more than the noun from which it is formed. Hence lexicographers define *aionios* to signify eternal, lasting, permanent, age of the world, etc., etc.

Perhaps it will be said, though both of these words are ambiguous, they may have been used by Jesus and the apostles precisely as for ages *ever*, *forever*, *everlasting*, and *eternal*, have been employed by divines to denote, when applied to punishment, its endless duration. We grant that such has long been the popular acceptation of these words, and that they have been employed by theologians to express the eternity of woe; and we are willing also to grant that if, in the times of Jesus and the apostles, the popular signification of *aion* and *aionios*, when applied to punishment, was endless, it is fair to infer that they meant to be understood as teaching endless misery, unless the connection in which the words are found necessarily restricts their meaning. That the connection does thus restrict it, Mr. Balfour has clearly shown, and on this point nothing need be added. What we propose to do, is to show that the popular signification of *aion* and *aionios*, when applied to punishment in the days of Christ, was right the opposite of what *ever*, *forever*, *everlasting* and *eternal*, are in our times; that while one who now applies the latter words to punishment is understood to teach its eternity, in the days of Christ and the

apostles none were understood to teach it when they applied the former to punishment. If we succeed in this, we shall give a full answer to the question, how Christ and the apostles could honestly have used *aion* and *aionios* in connection with punishment, if they did not believe it endless. A preacher of universal salvation could not honestly threaten sinners with everlasting punishment and eternal damnation, without very distinctly showing that he did not use those words in their popular sense. Therefore, if we find the cotemporaries and successors of Christ, who denied the eternity of misery, threatening sinners with *aionion* punishment, without any explanation of the sense in which they used it, the inference will be fair that its popular acceptation then was different from what it is now.

Some aid on this important point may be gained from Josephus who finished his Antiquities of the Jews in A. D. 93. We find him often using *aion* to signify *time indefinite*, *age*. He says that Esau should obtain renown forever (*di aionos*), Ant. I. XVIII. 8, vol. i. 119. He calls the landmarks of the Jews a limitation of rights made by God himself to last forever (*eis aiona*), Ant. IV. VIII. 18, vol. i. 213. He represents a Roman senator, after the death of Caligula, expressing the wish that the quiet might endure for all time (*eis pan tou aionos*), Ant. XIX. II. 2, vol. iv. 135. We find many such cases in Josephus; and also many showing that he very often used *aionios*, as he did *aion*, to signify *long duration*. The remembrance left by the patriarchs is called everlasting (*aionion*), Ant. I. XIII. 4; vol. i. 111, 112. He represents the Jewish soldiers as being promised everlasting (*aionion*) celebrity, Ant. XII. VII. 3, vol. iii. 43, 44, and he says Manahem predicted that Herod the Great should acquire everlasting (*aionion*) fame, Ant. XX. X. 5, vol. iii. 250.

Philo Judæus, who wrote between A. D. 20 or 30 and the middle of the first century, uses *aionios* very much in the same sense. He styles the punishment inflicted by the strong upon those who make false promises lasting (*aionios*), Fragmenta, tome ii. p. 667. He speaks of the sagacity of the brute as long-reaching (*aionia*), tome ii. p. 397; of the divine allotments as

distinguished by a constant (*aionia*) order, "quisquis virtuti studet," tome ii. p. 449.

We now proceed to authorities that bear more directly upon the question under consideration. In the Sibylline Oracles, sinners are said to be condemned to an intense fiery torment, which is frequently called everlasting; and yet they teach distinctly the doctrine of universal salvation. Justin Martyr, who believed in the annihilation of the wicked, repeatedly calls their punishment everlasting. These two authorities reach down to a period as late as A. D. 150. Irenæus, whose writings bring us to A. D. 180, says, the unjust shall be sent into inextinguishable and eternal fire; and yet he believed in their annihilation. Some other writers speak of punishment as everlasting, though there is no evidence that they believed it endless; for the fact just stated proves that *aionios* is no criterion by which to decide. We know that many, before this period, believed in universal salvation, among whom were the Basilidians, Carpocrations and Valentinians; they date back to near the beginning of the second century; and though regarded by what were called the orthodox as heretics, no objection was ever made to their faith in the salvation of the world, which is full proof that in those times this was not heresy, but good orthodoxy.

The first Christian writer who asserted that punishment was of equal duration with happiness, was Tertullian, a man whose heart was well fitted to enjoy his barbarous doctrine. Cotemporary with him was Clemens, a man of great eminence and excellency of character, a profound scholar, and a true Christian. Universal salvation was a prominent doctrine in his writings. While he was illustrating and enforcing his benevolent faith, Tertullian sent out his Apology, bearing date about A. D. 200, in which he declared that punishment was endless, and described the exultation he should have in beholding the torments of the damned! Thus he has the honor of being the first Christian Father known to teach endless misery.

The next writer of importance was Origen, who began to publish his works about A. D. 220. He was a stanch advocate of universal salvation; and yet he frequently threatens sinners with

everlasting fire and everlasting punishment, and without offering a word to show that he did not mean endless fire and punishment. This, then, settles the question, and shows beyond all doubt that *aion* and *aionios*, in connection with punishment, had not, even as late as the time of Origen, acquired their present popular signification.

Rev. H. Ballou, 2d, D. D., in his Ancient History of Universalism, from whom we have gathered the facts presented relative to this subject, says: "In all his works, Origen freely uses the expressions *everlasting fire*, *everlasting punishment*, etc., without any explanation, such as our modern prepossessions would render necessary, to prevent a misunderstanding. It should also be particularly remarked, that, among the numerous passages in which he advances Universalism, there is not an instance of his treating it in the way of controversy with the orthodox; and that, on the other hand, they themselves did not, so far as we can discover, censure or oppose it. Sometimes he avails himself of its peculiar principles to vindicate Christianity from the reproaches or witticisms of the heathens, and to maintain the benevolence of the one God against the objections of the Gnostics. Sometimes, again, he states and defines it, in a formal and labored manner; but in most cases he introduces it incidentally, either as the natural result of some well-known Christian principle, or as the positive doctrine of particular scriptures."

Thus there was not the slightest danger that Jesus and the apostles would be misunderstood; for the popular acceptation of *aion* and *aionios* in their day was a limited time, or time indefinite. Judging, therefore, by their use in the age when the New Testament was written, these words can give no support to the eternity of misery; for their received meaning was *time indefinite*. They owe all their influence, upon the public mind, against universal salvation, to a false education, to a meaning acquired since the time of Christ.

The following facts corroborate the foregoing views.

1. The cotemporaries of Christ, that believed in endless misery, never employed *aion* or *aionios* to express it. The favorite epithet of Philo for endless was *aidios*, with other words signifying *immor-*

tal, interminable. While he applied such words to punishment, he used *aionios*, as we have seen, in a temporal sense. Josephus also thus employs *aidios*. He says the Pharisees believe "that the souls of the base are allotted *aidios ergmos* to an endless prison." He also says the Essenes believe that the souls of the bad are sent to a dark, tempestuous cavern full of *aidialeiptos timoria*, incessant punishment. Thus these believers in endless misery did not express it by the terms applied by Christ and the apostles to punishment. *Aionion* punishment then, in the times of which we speak, did not signify an endless one. Josephus, like Philo, uses *aionios* to denote limited punishment. He calls the imprisonment to which the Romans doomed the tyrant John, *aionion* imprisonment.

2. The Greek fathers of the first four centuries, who opposed the doctrine of universal salvation, did not employ *aion* or *aionios* against it. This is a fact of great significance; for if the words in question were then understood as they now are, they certainly would have been adduced to prove endless misery. The present use made of them is positive proof of this. No writer now appeals to the Bible, in opposing Universalism, without urging against it these words.

5. There is no instance on record, till early in the 5th century, in which *aion* or *aionios* is employed to prove endless misery. Augustine, a Latin writer, was the first to argue that as *aionios* is applied to punishment the same as to life, both must be of equal duration. Though a man of talents, he is said to have been a poor Greek scholar. The fact that none reasoned thus before him, shows conclusively, that it was some centuries after Christ before the words we are considering acquired their present signification.

The foregoing facts clearly prove, that if Christ and the apostles used *aion* and *aionios* in their popular sense, they did not mean to express by them endless punishment. O. A. S.

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE EXTENT OF DURATION EXPRESSED BY THE TERMS OLIM, AION, AND AIONION, RENDERED EVERLASTING, FOREVER, ETC., IN THE COMMON VERSION, ESPECIALLY WHEN APPLIED TO PUNISHMENT.

SECTION I.

ALL THE TEXTS NOTICED WHERE OLIM OCCURS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, BUT IS RENDERED BY WORDS WHICH DO NOT EXPRESS OR IMPLY ETERNAL DURATION.

TAYLOR, in his Hebrew Concordance, on the word *olim*, says, "The word is applied to time, and signifieth a duration which is concealed, as being of an unknown or great length, with respect either to time past or to come." After quoting some texts, which he supposed proof of this, he adds: "It signifies eternity, not from the proper force of the word, but when the sense of the place, or the nature of the subject to which it is applied, requireth it; as God and his attributes." As he refers to no text to show that when applied to punishment it signifies eternity, it may be inferred that he did not think it was ever so applied. Parkhurst, on the word *olim*,

says, "It seems to be much more frequently used for an indefinite than for infinite time." And in his Greek Lexicon, on the words *aion* and *aionios*, he says, that the Hebrew word *olim* answers as the corresponding word for these two words in the Greek of the Seventy, "which words denote time hidden from man, whether indefinite or definite, whether past or future." Professor Stuart, in his letters to Dr. Miller, p. 128, commenting on Mic. 5: 1, says: "The words *kedesh* and *od*, rendered by Turretine, eternity, are like the Greek *aion*, that also signifies anything ancient, which has endured or is to endure for a long period. The question when these words are to have the sense of ancient or very old is always to be determined by the nature of the case, that is, by the context."

Concessions such as these, from critics on the language of Scripture, ought to lead every man to examine if these terms are ever used in the Bible to express the endless duration of punishment. Mr. Stuart's rule, if applied with attention to the general usage of these terms, would soon cool the zeal of many people, who seem to dwell with peculiar delight on the endless duration of punishment to their fellow-creatures. It is evident that the translators of the common version were fully aware that *olim* was often used by the sacred writers to express a limited period of time, for,

1st. They render it continuance, Isai. 64: 5.

2d. Ancient, and apply it to landmarks. Prov. 22: 28. To people. Isai. 44: 7. To paths. Jer. 18: 15. To high-places. Ezek. 36: 2. To nations. Jer. 5: 15. To times. Psalm 77: 5, which is explained to mean old. Had *olim* in these texts been rendered eternal, or everlasting, as in some other places, the impropriety would be very manifest. We would then have had an eternal landmark, an everlasting people, eternal paths, and everlasting high places; yea, an everlasting nation, and eternal times. But they had no idea that this word always expressed endless duration, and accordingly rendered it

ancient, as the context of the passages demanded. In the last text they have rendered *olim* both by the word old and ancient, which, if rendered eternal or everlasting, the passages would read thus: "I have considered the days of everlasting, the years of eternal times."

3d. *Olim* is rendered old, and is equivalent to ancient, as in the last class of passages. Thus the "days of old" is explained to mean "the years of many generations." Deut. 32: 7; Isai. 63: 9; comp. verse 11, which shows that the days of old refer to the days of Moses. Jer. 6: 16; Lam. 3: 6; Amos 9: 11; Mic. 7: 14; Mal. 3: 4. In this last text "days of old" is explained to be "former years," and in the margin our translators have put "ancient years." See, also, Job 22: 15: Prov. 23: 10; Isai. 58: 12, where we read of the "old way," the "old landmark," and "the old waste places." The explanation given in this last text is, "Thou shalt raise up the foundations of many generations." The same is repeated, chap. 61: 4. In the following texts *olim* is rendered old, and is applied to a variety of things which it would only be a waste of time to particularize. Ezek. 25: 15; Jer. 28: 8; Gen. 6: 4; 1 Sam. 27: 8; Psalm 119: 52; Isai. 46: 9; comp. verse 10, Ezek. 26: 20; Josh. 24: 2; Jer. 2: 20; Psalm 25: 6; Isai. 57: 11, and 51: 9. "Ancient days" and "generations old" are used as explanatory of each other. Eccles. 1: 10. Such are all the texts in which *olim* is rendered old, and on which we shall submit a few brief remarks. Let it be then supposed for a moment that it had been rendered everlasting, or by any other word which has the idea of endless duration affixed to it, what would follow? It may be observed, as an example, that men are called on to remember the days of everlasting, that God carried Israel all the days of everlasting, and that some are spoken of as dead from everlasting. Besides; the everlasting waste places were to be built, and the giants were from everlasting, men of renown. Whoever chooses to go over all the above texts will see that to translate

olim everlasting or eternal, would involve the inspired writers in the grossest absurdities. It is evident that, in all these texts, as in the preceding, *olim*, rendered old, signifies ancient. Though it expresses a long, indefinite period of time, yet it would not be very difficult to ascertain, in some instances at least, how many years were meant. If *olim* then, in any text rendered everlasting or eternal, does convey the sense of endless duration, it is obvious that it cannot have this meaning in any of the texts which have yet been brought to view. Both the texts and their contexts forbid this, and we have seen that an explanation is given of this word by the sacred writers to prevent all misapprehension on the subject.

4th. In the following places *olim* is rendered any, long, any time, long time, long home, and long dead. Levit. 25: 32; Isai. 42: 14; Eccles. 12; 5; Psalm 143: 3. To understand *olim* as meaning everlasting in these texts, would make the inspired writers to say that some have been eternally dead, that the grave is man's everlasting home, and that God has eternally held his peace.

5th. In the following texts *olim* is rendered world. Psalm 73: 12; Eccles. 3: 11; Isai. 64: 4. The language used, John 9: 32, seems to be taken from this last text, and, in both, the meaning seems to be, since the age began, probably referring to the Mosaic age or dispensation. In Isai. 45: 17, it is said, "Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation: ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end." Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, says it signifies "the ages of perpetuity." I would merely suggest it for consideration, if the phrase "world without end" does not refer to the age or dispensation of the Messiah, which age was not to be succeeded by any other, and corresponds to passages in the New Testament where it is said to be everlasting, and to endure forever. Whatever may may be in this, we think it is evident that *olim*, rendered world, in these texts, does not mean endless duration. How does it sound to say that God sets eternity in the

hearts of men, and that the ungodly prosper in the eternity? *Olim*, rendered world in these texts, seems to be used in a similar sense as *aion* and *aionion*, translated world in the New Testament. Age, in both, would be a better rendering, for surely neither the material world nor eternity can be referred to.

6th. In Jer. 59: 36, *olim* is translated "outcasts." Why, I cannot conceive. As it cannot affect the subject under consideration, it would not be of much use to spend time in inquiring.

7th. In Deut. 33: 15, the word *olim* is rendered "lasting." Lasting hills, in the last part, is another expression for ancient mountains in the first, "and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills." It will be seen presently, that *olim*, here translated "ancient" and "lasting," and applied to the mountains and hills, might as well have been translated everlasting, as it is in Gen. 49: 26, and Hab. 3: 6, and applied to the same things. But I forbear further remarks until we come to those passages.

8th. I find that *olim* is rendered alway, and always, Jer. 20: 17; Gen. 6: 3; 1 Chron. 16: 16; Job 7: 16; Psalm 119: 112. In this last text David explains always by adding "even unto the end." But everlasting or eternity has no end.

9th. Sometimes *olim* is rendered any more. Ezek. 27: 36, and 28: 19. The prophet is speaking of Tyre, and the sense evidently is, that it should not be any more, as formerly, a place famous for trade.

10th. It is rendered ever, in the following places: 2 Sam. 12: 10; Judg. 2: 1; Psalm 15: 5; 30: 6; 31: 1; 55: 22; 71: 1; and 119: 93; Prov. 10: 30; Isai. 14: 20; 25: 2; Ezek. 26: 21; Joel 2: 26, 27. But surely no one ever thought that never in these texts expresses endless duration. For example, was the sword not to depart from David's house to the endless ages of eternity? And was God's covenant with Israel to have

no end? We are sure it has waxed old and vanished away. In short, we use the word never every day in a similar way, but no one interprets our language as meaning endless duration. In the New Testament we shall see that the word *aion* is also rendered never, and is applied in a similar way.

SECTION II.

ALL THE PASSAGES NOTICED WHERE OLIM IS USED, AND RENDERED BY WORDS WHICH CONVEY THE IDEA OF ENDLESS DURATION.

If the sacred writers used the term *olim* to express limited duration in so many instances, as we have seen in the preceding section, our translators rendering the same word by English terms expressing endless duration, can never give it such a signification. In the texts now to be introduced, they have rendered *olim* by the words perpetual, everlasting, eternal, forever, and for ever and ever; but can such renderings alter the sense in which the sacred writers used it? No; for we shall see that the things to which it is applied, and the scope of the contexts, in a great many instances, at least, utterly forbid it. This is universally acknowledged, and will presently be seen from the passages. It will be perceived that this word is used to express duration that is past. The reader has then to consider whether it refers to endless duration which is past. It also expresses duration to come, and it must be considered whether it is used to express a proper eternity to come. In short, we have to examine with attention whether this word, rendered perpetual, eternal, forever, and for ever and ever, was designed to express the endless duration of the things to which the sacred writers apply it. The question is not, Are the persons or things to which it is applied of

endless duration in their natures? but Was this term used to express it? Is it this word which shows they are of endless duration?

1. I find *olim*, then, is rendered "perpetual," and applied in the following manner. The covenant God made with Noah was to be "for perpetual generations." Gen. 9 : 12. The priest's office was to be Aaron's and his sons, "for a perpetual statute." Exod. 29 : 9. The suburbs of certain cities were to be the inheritance of the Levites, "for a perpetual possession." Levit. 25 : 34. Certain portions were to be the provision of Aaron and his sons, by "a perpetual statute." Levit. 24 : 9. It was to be "a perpetual statute" that the person who sprinkled the water of separation should be unclean until the even. Num. 19 : 21. The Sabbath was to be observed by the children of Israel, throughout their generations, "for a perpetual covenant." Exod. 31 : 16. To them it was also to be "a perpetual statute" that they should neither eat fat nor blood. Levit. 3 : 17. The meat-offering was to be "a perpetual ordinance unto the Lord." Ezek. 46 : 14. And the children of Israel are spoken of as saying, Come and let us join ourselves to the Lord in "a perpetual covenant." Jer. 50 : 5. In all these passages the word perpetual is applied to things belonging to the Mosaic dispensation, which was never intended to be endless in its duration. *Olim* is rendered perpetual in these passages, and it is rendered everlasting in others, and applied to the same things. Indeed, had our translators consulted uniformity in their version, they would have always rendered it so. What, then, does perpetual or everlasting express when applied to the things belonging to the Jewish dispensation? We think it is obvious that it simply signifies that those things were to be observed by the Jews while that dispensation continued. When it ended, the everlasting or perpetual ended.

But, further; we find *olim* rendered perpetual, and applied as follows. Speaking of Babylon, and other

places, it is said they shall be made "perpetual desolations." Jer. 25 : 9—12; Ezek. 35 : 9; Zeph. 2 : 9. And of Bozrah, and other cities, that they shall be "perpetual wastes." Jer. 59 : 13. And speaking of some persons it is said, Psalm 78 : 66, that God would put them to "a perpetual reproach." God also threatened Israel, Jer. 18 : 16, to make their land a "perpetual hissing;" and bring on them "a perpetual shame." 23 : 40. Concerning the people of Seir it is said that they had against Israel "a perpetual hatred." Ezek. 35 : 5. Of some persons it is said they shall sleep "a perpetual sleep." Jer. 51 : 39, and repeated, verse 57. Besides, we find it said, Jer. 5 : 22, that the Lord placed "the sand for the bound of the sea by a perpetual decree that it cannot pass it." Moreover, we find it declared, Hab. 3 : 6, that the hills are perpetual. "He stood, and measured the earth : he beheld, and drove asunder the nations : and the everlasting mountains were scattered, the perpetual hills did bow : his ways are everlasting." In this last text *olim* is rendered both perpetual and everlasting, and, without scruple, is applied to the hills and mountains, as well as to the ways of God. These are all the texts in which *olim* is rendered in our version perpetual. On the whole of them I shall now make a few brief remarks.

1st. It is evident, from the last quoted text, that perpetual and everlasting are used to express the same idea. The "everlasting mountains," and "the perpetual hills," are synonymous expressions. When it is, therefore, said that the mountains and hills are perpetual or everlasting, few ever infer that they had existed from eternity, or would exist to endless duration. The everlasting nature of their existence, as to time past, is limited to the time of their creation, and, in regard to futurity, their existence is bounded by the dissolution of the present world. Here, then, is an everlasting bounded by time, and does not extend to endless duration, either as to the past or future.

2d. In all the above texts, where *olim* is rendered perpetual, it is never used to express endless duration. The things to which it is applied clearly decide this. Unless this world is to continue to endless duration, how is the sand to be a perpetual bound to the sea, and the hills and mountains never cease to exist? Moreover, how are Babylon and other places to be endless desolations? In short, if perpetual expresses such duration, some are to sleep endlessly. The question, perhaps, may be asked, "How long does perpetual mean in the above texts?" To this I answer, that in all of them it does not designate the same period of time. The longest period expressed by it is not extended beyond the existence of this world. In the place where it is said some were to sleep a perpetual sleep, the Babylonians are referred to; they were asleep when their city was taken, and, being killed while asleep, they no more awoke in this world; and hence their sleep is called perpetual. If perpetual is understood to mean endless, those persons are never to be raised from the dead. Such, then, as maintain a universal resurrection of all the dead, must give up the idea that *olim*, rendered perpetual, signifies a proper eternity.

3d. In none of the above texts a reference is made to a punishment of the wicked in the future state. But even admitting that in a number of them it had been expressly declared that the wicked, and the wicked in a future state of existence, should be punished with perpetual torments, this would prove nothing conclusive that these torments are endless. This must be obvious to every man who considers how often perpetual is applied to things which have ended, and to things also which we are sure are to end. From the common usage of this word, we ought to conclude that the torments of the wicked may come to an end also. But, as nothing is said about future punishment in any of the above texts, we need not trouble ourselves with any further remarks concerning them. I may just add, What difference can it make, as to the meaning of the word *olim*, whether we

render it everlasting or perpetual? Can the rendering alter the true sense of the writer?

2. We find, also, that *olim* is rendered "everlasting." The covenant that God made with Noah and every living creature is called "the everlasting covenant." Gen. 9: 16. Also, that which he made with Abraham and his seed is called "an everlasting covenant." Gen. 17: 7, 13, 18. It is called the same when confirmed to Israel, 1 Chron. 16: 17; Psalm 105: 10; and also to David, 2 Sam. 23: 5. And it is said of Israel, Isai. 24: 5, that they had "broken the everlasting covenant." In the following places an everlasting covenant is spoken of, and seems to refer to the new covenant: Isai. 55: 3, and 61: 8; Jer. 32: 40; Ezek. 16: 60, and 37: 26. But, in whatever way this may be decided, all will allow that it must end when Christ delivers up the kingdom to God the Father. The new dispensation, or age of the Messiah, is not called everlasting because it is endless in its duration, but because when it ends it is to be succeeded by no other. But, further, we find the land of Canaan promised to Israel for "an everlasting possession." Gen. 17: 8, and 48: 4. The priesthood given to Aaron and his sons was to be "an everlasting priesthood." But, as an explanation of what is meant, it is added, "throughout your generations." See Exod. 40: 15; Numb. 25: 13. Certain things under the Aaronical priesthood, and connected with that covenant, though temporary in its duration, were to be for an "everlasting statute." Levit. 24: 8, 16, 24. In Gen. 49: 26, we read of the everlasting hills, and in Hab. 3: 6, of the everlasting mountains; and in Psalm 24: 7—9, of the everlasting doors, probably referring to the doors of the temple.

Before adducing any more of the texts in which *olim* is rendered everlasting, I beg leave to make one or two remarks. It is easily perceived, by comparing these texts with those where *olim* is rendered perpetual, that everlasting and perpetual express the same idea. Further; unless we can prove that the land of Canaan, the

statutes and ordinances of the Jewish dispensation, the hills and mountains, and the doors of the temple, are to continue to endless duration, we ought not to say that the word everlasting expresses a proper eternity. We presume no one would contend that it does; but some, perhaps, would say that it does express the endless duration of the new covenant mentioned in some of the above passages. But why should it any more mean this, when applied to it, than when applied to the old covenant, which was called everlasting, yet has long ago vanished? Is it, then, asked, What does everlasting mean in the above texts? I answer, It expresses a period of time, long, indefinite, and limited. Do we read of the priesthood of Aaron being everlasting? We find this, in as many words, limited; for it is added, "throughout your generations." In a word, any long period of time, either past or to come, is called everlasting. Yea, we shall see, before we are done, that it sometimes expresses even a short period of time. Nor are the sacred writers under any apprehension that they were liable to be misunderstood. But to return.

We find, further, *olim* rendered everlasting, and applied as follows. In Isai. 45: 17, it is said, "But Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation." This is explained by what follows: "Ye shall not be ashamed nor confounded world without end." See this text noticed before. Daniel, 9: 24, speaks of an "everlasting righteousness," and David, Psalm 112: 6, says, "The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance." In Prov. 10: 25, they are also said to be "an everlasting foundation." David prays, Psalm 139: 24, "Lead me in the way everlasting." And, in Jer. 31: 3, God says, "I have loved thee with an everlasting love." And, in Isai. 60: 19, 20, it is twice said that "God is their everlasting light." And, in Isai. 35: 10, they shall come to Zion with "everlasting joy." This is repeated, 51: 11 and 61: 7. In Isai. 56: 5, God is said to give them an "everlasting name;" and to have made

to himself "an everlasting name," Isai. 63 : 12. In Isai. 55 : 13, we read of an "everlasting sign," and, by way of explanation, it is added, "which shall not be cut off." And, in Isai. 54 : 8, we read of God's "everlasting kindness." Speaking of the Jews, God threatened that he would bring upon them "an everlasting reproach." Jer. 23 : 40. And, in Jer. 20 : 11, it is added, "Their everlasting confusion shall never be forgotten." By consulting the context of these last two texts, it may be seen that God is not speaking of punishment to the Jews in a future state, but of his temporal judgments in the present world. Notwithstanding this, their punishment is called everlasting. This we have shown in our First Inquiry. See also on 2 Thess. chap. 1, below.

We come now to the texts where *olim* is rendered everlasting, and is applied to God. Such texts demand the closest attention. In Gen. 21 : 33, Abraham "called upon the name of the Lord, the everlasting God." In Isai. 40 : 28, he again calls him the "everlasting God." In Deut. 33 : 27, we read of his "everlasting arms." In Psalm 90 : 2, it is said, "Even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God." And, in Jer. 10 : 10, he is called "an everlasting king." In Psalm 100 : 5, it is said, "His mercy is everlasting;" in 103 : 17, "The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting." But, by way of explanation, it is said, "His righteousness unto children's children." In 41 : 13, it is said, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting, and to everlasting." This is repeated, Psalm 106 : 48. Again, it is said, Psalm 93 : 2, "Thou art from everlasting;" but, in the first part of the verse, it was said, as an equivalent expression, "Thy throne is established of old." In Isai. 63 : 16, it is said, "Thy name is from everlasting;" and, Psalm 145 : 13, David says, "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom;" but, observe, it is added, by way of explanation, "and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations." In the margin our translators have put "of all ages." And, in Isai. 26 :

4, it is said, "In the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength;" but in the margin they have put "rock of ages." These are all the passages where *olim* is rendered everlasting, and applied to God. There are two passages where it is so rendered, and applied to the Messiah. The first is Mic. 5: 2, "Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." See, on this text, Professor Stuart's remarks, quoted Section I. Here, from of old and everlasting are used as synonymous expressions for the same thing. This is similar to Psalm 93: 2, noticed above. The other text is Prov. 8: 23, "I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was." Here, what is called everlasting in the first part is explained in the second to be "from the beginning." Has everlasting, or a proper eternity, a beginning?

3. We find *olim* rendered for evermore in the following places. Thus it is said, Psalm 92: 8, "But thou, Lord, art most high for evermore." And, 113: 2, "Blessed be the name of the Lord from this time forth and for evermore." And, 115: 18, "But we will bless the Lord from this time forth and for evermore." Again, it is said, 2 Sam. 22: 51, the Lord "showeth mercy to his anointed, unto David, and to his seed for evermore." This is repeated Psalm 18: 50. In 1 Chron. 17: 14, God promised that Solomon's throne "should be established for evermore." And, Psalm 121: 8, he promised to preserve Israel "for evermore;" and, 133: 3, to command "the blessing for evermore." In Ezek. 37: 26, 28, he also promised to set his sanctuary in the midst of Israel "for evermore." And, in Psalm 37: 27, David says, "Depart from evil and do good, and dwell for evermore;" and, in 86: 12, says, "I will glorify thy name for evermore." The only other text in which *olim* is rendered for evermore is Psalm 106: 31, and is thus explained. Speaking of Phinehas, it is said that what he did "was counted unto him for righteousness, unto all generations for evermore." Here, all genera-

tions and for evermore are used as equivalent expressions for the same thing. On the whole of these texts we remark that evermore is applied to things which never were intended to continue to endless duration. Such were Solomon's throne and God's sanctuary among the children of Israel. A long period may be meant, but not surely a proper eternity. Even when evermore is applied to God, we cannot conclude that it signifies endless duration; for it is explained to mean "all generations." In none of these texts is evermore applied to punishment. Further remarks will be more in place afterwards.

4. *Olim* is rendered forever in the following places, and expresses the duration of a man's lifetime, or even a shorter period. Thus it is said, Deut. 15: 17, "Thou shalt take an awl and thrust it through his ear unto the door, and he shall be thy servant forever." Now this could only mean all the servant's lifetime, or, perhaps, to the year of jubilee. It could not be beyond his life, for at death the servant is free from his master. The same is said Exod. 21: 6. But, again, we find Samuel's mother saying, 1 Sam. 1: 22, "I will not go up until the child be weaned, and then I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord, and abide there forever." Here, forever can mean no more than all the days of Samuel's life. Again; Jonadab commanded his children that they should drink "no more wine forever." Jer. 35: 6. Does not this simply mean all their days, or, at furthest, throughout their generation? And is not something similar meant when Achish said of David, 1 Sam. 27: 12, "He shall be my servant forever"? And also, Levit. 25: 46, where it is said strangers shall be to Israel "bondmen forever." And, 2 Kings 5: 27, it is said that the leprosy was to cleave to Naaman "forever." But who ever thought this man was to be a leper to the endless ages of eternity? In Job 41: 4, speaking of the leviathan, it is said, "Wilt thou take him for a servant forever?" There is one text which de-

serves particular notice, because it is the first time in which the word *olim* is used in the Bible and is rendered forever. Thus, Gen. 3 : 22, "And now lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat and live forever," therefore God drove forth the man from the garden. On this text let us hear Dr. Kennicot, the great Hebrew scholar of his day. He says, Dissert. i. p. 83, "A third objection may be made to the rendering of the word *lolim*, in chap. 3 : 22 — that it is made to signify the days of Adam's life only, and not forever. In answer to this, I observe that the word *olim* is used as often, perhaps, finitely as infinitely; and that it can signify nothing more than the age or life of man in places where our translators have frequently rendered it forever. Thus, Exod. 21 : 6, 'Then his master shall bring him unto the judges, and he shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever.' And, 1 Sam. 1 : 22, 'But Hannah went not up; for she said, I will not go up until the child be weaned; and then I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord, and there abide forever.'" But, further, we find Bathsheba says, 1 Kings 1 : 31, "Let my lord king David live forever." And, in Neh. 2 : 3, he says to king Artaxerxes, "Let the king live forever." See the same or similar language, Dan. 2 : 4; 3 : 9; 5 : 10; and 6 : 6, 21. All meant in these texts is, let the king's life be long, or the years of his life be many. The persons never supposed that kings could live to the endless ages of eternity. In Exod. 14 : 13, it is said to Israel that the Egyptians whom they saw to-day they should see "no more forever." No more can be meant than that they should not see them again; and the reason is obvious, for they were all to be drowned in the sea.

In the following texts certain places are said to be forever. In Eccles. 1 : 4, it is said, "The earth abideth forever;" and, Psalm 104 : 5, "Who laid the foundations of the earth, that they should not be removed forever;" and, Psalm 78 : 69, "He built his sanctuary

like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established forever." God is said to give the land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed, that they should dwell in it forever; and David be their prince forever. See Ezek. 37: 25. In all the following texts the land of Canaan is said to be forever to Abraham and his seed. See Gen. 13: 15; Exod. 32: 13; 1 Chron. 28: 8; 2 Chron. 20: 7; Isai. 60; 21; Josh. 14: 9. This last text refers to that part of the land given to Caleb, which was to be his and his children's forever. And are not some lands deeded away forever now in a similar sense? Israel is commanded not to seek the peace nor the wealth of the inhabitants of Canaan forever. Ezra 9: 12. In Deut. 23: 6, we have the same injunction repeated; and it is added, "all thy days forever." Here all thy days and forever are used to express the same period of time, and simply mean throughout the generations of Israel. It was a sign between the Lord and Israel forever that in six days God made heaven and earth and rested on the seventh. Exod. 31: 17. The children of Israel dwelling in Canaan or inheriting it forever is contrary to fact. For nearly two thousand years the Jews have been cast out of it, and should they return to-day, and dwell in it as long as this earth shall continue, yet, unless the world is to be of endless duration, forever does not express an infinite period of time. It is further said, 1 Chron. 23: 25, "The Lord God of Israel hath given rest unto his people, that they may dwell in Jerusalem forever." And, in Jer. 17: 25, it is said, "And this city shall remain forever." And, referring to it, David says, Psalm 48: 8, "God will establish it forever." And, in Jer. 31: 40, it is said, "It shall not be plucked up nor thrown down any more forever." And, in Psalm 125: 1, it is said, "They that trust in the Lord shall be like mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth forever." And, referring to the temple, Solomon says, 1 Kings 8: 13, "I have surely built thee a house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in forever." For

substance repeated, 2 Chron. 6 : 2. And, in 2 Chron. 30 : 8, it is said to be "sanctified forever." But what is meant by Jerusalem remaining "forever" is explained thus, Joel 3 : 20, "But Judah shall dwell forever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation." Again, Josh. 8 : 28, it is said, "Joshua burnt Ai and made it an heap forever." It is added, by way of explanation, "even a desolation unto this day." And of Babylon it is said, Isai. 47 : 7, "I shall be a lady forever." But God says concerning this city, Jer. 51 : 26, "Thou shalt be desolate forever;" and, verse 62, it is added, "None shall remain in it, neither man nor beast, but it shall be desolate forever." Of Hazor and other cities it is said they "shall be a dwelling for dragons, and a desolation forever: there shall no man abide there, nor any son of man dwell in it." Jer. 49 : 33. And of another place it is said, "The smoke thereof shall go up forever," and that the wild beasts "shall possess it forever." Isai. 34 : 14, 17. The explanation of forever in the last text is given thus: "From generation to generation it shall lie waste," and "from generation to generation wild beasts shall dwell therein." See verses 8—17. In Psalm 49 : 11, it is said that the inward thought of the wicked is that their houses shall continue "forever." But the explanation given is, "and their dwelling-places to all generations."

The word *olim* is rendered forever, and applied in a variety of ways to the laws and ordinances of the Mosaic dispensation. It was a statute, "forever throughout their generations," that they "should not sacrifice their children to devils," Levit. 17 : 7; nor eat of the fruits of the land until they had brought a part of it unto the Lord. Levit. 23 : 14. It was an ordinance, forever throughout their generations, that the stranger and the children of Israel were to be alike in offering certain offerings to the Lord. Num. 15 : 15, and 19 : 10. It was also a statute, "forever unto their generations," that Aaron and his sons should enjoy certain things and per-

form certain parts of service. Exod. 27: 21; Levit. 24: 3; Exod. 28: 43, 29: 28, and 30: 21; Levit. 6: 18, 22, 7: 34, 36, and 10: 9, 15; Numb. 10: 8, and 18: 8, 11, 19, 23; 1 Chron. 15: 2, and 23: 13; 2 Chron. 2: 4; Exod. 12: 14; comp. verses 17, 24: Levit. 23: 41; comp. verses 33—41; Levit. 16: 31; Comp. verse 29, and 23: 31. The laws and ordinances enjoined in these texts all relate to the old dispensation, which has vanished away. But all must see they were to be observed "forever," and the fact shows that endless duration could not possibly be meant by this expression. The children of Israel were a peculiar people, separated from all other nations, and for certain important purposes, which would be aside from our present purpose to detail. Such laws and ordinances were to be observed by them "forever," and this forever was as long as they existed as a nation, and until the purposes of God were answered by them. Hence "in your generations," and "throughout your generations," or some similar explanatory expression is used. Both seem to express the continued practice of those laws and ordinances, but not the endless duration of their observance. This law was added because of transgression "till the seed should come." In the hope of the promise of the Messiah being fulfilled, the twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hoped to come. When Christ had fulfilled all that was written of him, it was virtually abolished, and Paul declared, in his day, it had waxed old, and was ready to vanish away. The "forever" was bounded by this period, and this was even a longer forever than some others spoken of in Scripture.

In the following texts, *forever* seems to express a long, indefinite period of time, but not endless duration. In Exod. 19: 9, the reason given for God's speaking to Moses in a cloud is that the people might believe him "forever." But does forever mean anything more than that Moses might be believed by all the future generations of Israel? It is also said, Ezek. 43: 7, that God

is to dwell in the midst of Israel "forever." But can this signify to endless duration? Can it mean anything more than what is said so often by way of explanation, "from generation to generation," or throughout their generations? See, also, verse 9. David says of God's commandments, that they were "ever with him." Psalm 119: 98. But does this mean anything more than a continuance in them? But, further, had Saul obeyed the Lord, Samuel told him that the Lord would have established his kingdom upon Israel "forever," 1 Sam. 13: 13. But I ask every candid man, did not Samuel mean that the kingdom would have been hereditary in Saul's family, or, as the Scriptures say, he should not have wanted "a man to sit on the throne"? David, on whom Saul's kingdom was bestowed, says that God chose him before all the house of his father "to be a king over Israel forever." 1 Chron. 28: 4. But did David mean that he and his seed should sit to endless duration on a throne in Israel? Is not the meaning simply this — that the kingdom should be hereditary in his family so long as Israel existed as a nation? We think this is evident from 2 Chron. 13: 5, where it is said, "Ought ye not to know that the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom over Israel to David forever, even to him and his sons by a covenant of salt?" Comp. 2 Chron. 9: 8. Besides, notice what is said, Psalm 89: 4, in confirmation of this, and in explanation of the meaning of the phrase "forever." It is said, "Thy seed will I establish forever;" but it is added, "and build up thy throne to all generations." All generations is surely not endless duration. Admitting that this ultimately referred to the Messiah, who was to be of the seed of David, yet it was understood of David's descendants. This seems evident from similar things being said of Solomon. See 1 Chron. 17: 23; 1 Kings 2: 45; 2 Sam. 7: 13, 16, 25; 1 Chron. 22: 10, and 28: 7, which I need not transcribe. It is also evident from the intrigues and attempts of David's sons and others to usurp the throne. The same

is said of the Messiah, Isai. 9: 7. "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever." But even when forever is applied to him, we doubt if this expresses the endless duration of his reign, but simply expresses that it shall never give place to any other in this world. One or two of our reasons for thinking so we shall only here state.

1st. If "forever," and "no end," in this passage, mean endless duration, it must be allowed that this world must also continue to endless duration. Is it asked how I make this appear? I answer, it is plainly said, to that of the *increase* of his government there shall be no end. But how is this to take place if this world is to end? The increase of his government takes place in this world, nor does any one refer its increase to a period after it ends. Either then this world has no end, but shall continue to afford an increase of subjects to Messiah's kingdom, or forever, and no end, here, do not mean endless duration. We have never heard of any increase of subjects to Christ's kingdom but while this world continued.

2d. Christ's kingdom, or his reign, is represented like the duration of the sun or the host of heaven. Psalm 72 is allowed to refer to him. In verse 19, it is said, "and blessed be his glorious name." And in verse 17 we find it said, "His name shall endure forever." If we ask, how long a time this forever is, we find it answered thus—"His name shall be continued as long as the sun." Again; it is said, Psalm 89: 29, "His seed also will I make to endure forever;" but it is added, "and his throne as the days of heaven." And in verses 36, 37, we find it said, "His seed shall endure forever," but it is again subjoined by way of explanation, "and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon." We think these texts limit the meaning of forever to the duration of the sun and moon, and the Messiah's reign

also to this period. This seems to be in agreement with what is said 1 Cor. 15 : 24—29, that, when Christ hath subdued all things, he shall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father, that he may be all in all. This period is called the end, and succeeds the resurrection of the dead.

I am aware that it may be objected, "If forever is thus limited to the end of this world, will it not follow that Christ's seed must end, for they are said to endure forever, which, according to this view, is only as long as the sun and moon endureth?" I answer, this does not follow; for Christ at this period is to deliver up the kingdom to God the Father, and surely this kingdom includes the subjects or Christ's seed. If delivered up to God, no one thinks that this is for the purpose of being annihilated, or to suffer endless punishment.

But, further, David prays that his house might continue blessed before God "forever." 2 Sam. 7 : 29; 1 Chron. 17 : 27. God promised to establish the throne of Solomon forever. 1 Kings 9 : 5. David declares himself guiltless before the Lord forever from the blood of Abner. 2 Sam. 3 : 28; Comp. 1 Kings 2 : 23. His kindness was not to be cut off from the house of Jonathan forever. 1 Sam. 20 : 15; Comp. verse 42. But could anything more be meant by forever, than so long as his house existed? Israel was to be unto God a people forever. 2 Sam. 7 24. See, also, 1 Chron. 17 : 22. Things revealed belonged to them and their children forever. Deut. 29 : 29. And if they obeyed God, it should go well with them and their children forever, Deut. 12 : 28," and by so doing, they would leave the land unto their children for an inheritance forever. Ezra 9 : 12. And if they did not obey the Lord, the curses in the law should be upon them for a sign and for a wonder forever, Deut. 28 : 46. Again; an Ammonite or Moabite was not to enter into the congregation of the Lord forever; and this is explained to be to the tenth generation. Deut. 23 : 3; Nehem. 13 : 1. The stones set up at Jordan were to be a memorial unto the children of Israel forever. Josh.

4 : 7. But did any man ever think that these stones were to stand there to the endless ages of eternity? If we understand forever to mean, as often explained, from generation to generation, or throughout the generations of Israel, no difficulty is perceived; but to understand it of endless duration, is absurd. Again; the Lord had said that the house of Eli should walk before him forever. 1 Sam. 2 : 30. But his conduct and that of his sons was such that God says, 1 Sam. 3 : 13, 14, "I will judge his house forever;" and that "the iniquity of his house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor burnt offerings forever." Some may think that their sins were unpardonable. No; what seems simply meant is that no sacrifice or burnt offering could avail so as to preserve the priesthood in Eli's family. Again; Israel is commanded to hope in the Lord forever, Psalm 131 : 3; and, in 125 : 2, the Lord is said to be round about them forever; and, 28 : 9, David prays that God would lift up his people forever; and, in 1 Chron. 29 : 18, that he would keep what is right in their hearts forever; and Psalm 12 : 7, that he would preserve them from this generation forever; and 37 : 18, says that the inheritance of the righteous shall be forever; and, verse 28, that they are preserved forever; and, 41 : 12, that God set him before his face forever; and, 73 : 26, that God was his portion forever; and it is said, Isai. 32 : 17, that the effect of righteousness was to be "quietness and assurance forever." In Psalm 30 : 12, David says, "I will give thanks unto thee forever;" and, in 44 : 8, that he would "praise God's name forever." See, also, 52 : 9. In 79 : 13, he says, "We will give thee thanks forever; but adds, as an explanation, "We will show forth thy praise to all generations." And, 75 : 9, he says, "I will declare forever," and explains himself thus, "I will sing praises to the God of Jacob." But, further, in Psalm 112 : 6, David says, a good man "shall not be moved forever." In 119 : 111, that he had taken God's testimonies "as an heritage forever;" and, verse 152,

"that God had founded them forever." In Psalm 5: 11, he says, "Let them that put their trust in the Lord ever shout for joy." Psalm 61: 4, David says, "I will abide in thy tabernacle forever." And God says, Hosea 2: 19, "I will betroth thee unto me forever." Psalm 45: 2, and probably speaking of the Messiah, it is said, "God hath blessed thee forever;" and, in Isa. 59: 21, it is declared that God's word was not to depart from him nor his seed "forever;" and, Psalm 61: 7, that he shall abide before God "forever." But, comparing verse 6, forever is explained thus, "Thou wilt prolong the king's life, and his years as many generations." In the margin it is "as generation and generation." Comp. Psalm 89: 36, 37, and 1 Chron. 17: 14. In 1 Kings 10: 9, it is said, God "loved Israel forever;" and, in Deut. 5: 29, that by "obeying him it would be well with them and their children forever." But again, speaking of God's temporal judgments, it is said, Joel 2: 2, to be a day "there hath not been ever the like." And of the dead it is said, Eccles. 9: 6, that they have no more a portion "forever" in anything done under the sun. Speaking of the descendants of Esau, it is said, Obad. 10, that they shall be cut off forever. Jonah says, 2: 6, that the bars of the earth were about him forever. In Zach. 1: 5, the question is asked concerning the prophets, Do they live forever? If forever is asserted to mean endless duration, it is here strongly implied that the prophets do not live forever. But the question here simply means, Do the prophets live to all generations? It is said of some, Psalm 81: 15, that "their time should have endured forever." And Solomon, Eccles. 2: 16, says, "There is no remembrance of the wise more than of the fool forever." And, David says, Psalm 49: 8, "The redemption of the soul, or the natural life from death, it ceaseth forever." And in Prov. 27: 24, it is said of riches, "They are not forever;" but the common explanation is added, "and doth the crown endure to every generation?"

But I find *olim*, rendered forever, applied to God in a variety of ways. These texts demand the closest attention, for it is in consequence of this that it is considered as expressing endless duration. Can it mean anything less than this, say some, seeing it is applied to Him who had no beginning and who shall have no end? This may be true, but it ought not to be admitted without sufficient evidence, seeing this same word is applied to so many things which all allow are not of endless duration. We shall therefore give this part of the subject all the care and attention we can command. *Olim*, then, is rendered forever and applied —

To the existence of God. Thus, in Deut. 32: 40, God says, "I live forever;" and, in Psalm 9: 7, "The Lord shall endure forever;" and, 102: 12, "Thou, O Lord, shalt endure forever;" but, observe, it is added, by way of explanation, "and thy remembrance unto all generations." In Lam. 5: 19, it is said, "Thou, O Lord, remainest forever;" but the common explanation is again given, for it is added, "and thy throne from generation to generation." And it is said, Eccles. 3: 14, that "Whatsoever God doeth it shall be forever." It is also applied to his name or character in general. Thus it is said, Exod. 3: 15, "This is my name forever;" and explained thus, "and this is my memorial unto all generations." His character, name, or glory, are the same. Hence it is said, Psalm 104: 31, "The glory of the Lord shall endure forever." And, Mic. 2: 9, God complains that his glory was taken away from some "forever." In 2 Sam. 7: 26, it is said, "Let thy name be magnified forever;" and is repeated, 1 Chron. 17: 24. In Psalm 135: 13, it is said, "Thy name, O Lord, endureth forever;" but, observe, it is added again, as an explanation, "and thy memorial, O Lord, throughout all generations. In the margin, "to generation and generation." In all the following passages, which I need not transcribe, God is spoken of as putting his name in his house "forever." 1 Kings 9: 3; 2 Chron. 7: 16; 2

Kings 21: 7; 2 Chron. 33: 4, 7. But, to proceed, we find forever applied to his truth. Psalm 117: 2, "The truth of the Lord endureth forever;" Psalm 146: 6, "He keepeth truth forever;" Isai. 40: 8, "The word of God shall stand forever." It is also applied to his faithfulness. Psalm 105: 8, "He hath remembered his covenant forever." What follows, by way of explanation, deserves particular notice: "The word which he commanded to a thousand generations." A thousand generations is a long period of time, but it is not eternity. Again, Psalm 111: 9, "He hath commanded his covenant forever;" and, verse 5, "He will ever be mindful of his covenant." It is also applied to his reign and power. Psalm 66: 7, "He ruleth by his power forever;" and, 29: 10, "The Lord sitteth king forever." In Mic. 4: 7, it is said of Israel, "The Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth even forever;" and, Psalm 146: 10, "The Lord shall reign forever, even thy God, O Zion." But here again the common explanation is given, "unto all generations." Also to his wisdom or counsel. In Psalm 33: 11, "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever;" but it is said, by way of explanation, "the thought of his heart to all generations." And to his righteousness or salvation. Isai. 51: 6, "My salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished." Now compare with this, verse 8, "My righteousness shall be forever, and my salvation from generation to generation." Does not "from generation to generation" here express precisely what is meant by "forever"?

But I find the word *olim* rendered forever and applied to God's mercy. The expression "for his mercy endureth forever" is found once in each of the following texts: 2 Chron. 5: 13; 20: 21; Ezra 3: 11; Psalm 106: 1; 107: 1; 138: 8; Jer. 33: 11. In each of the following places it occurs twice: 2 Chron. 7: 3, 6; 1 Chron. 16: 34, 41. In Psalm 118: 1—4, 29, it is found five times; and in Psalm 136 it occurs no less

than twenty-six times. The expression "for his mercy endureth forever" is found, then, forty-two times in the Old Testament. The reason for being so particular in thus numbering the places will appear presently. Although the following texts do not contain this precise expression, yet it is evident they have an affinity to the present topic. I shall, therefore, introduce them here, before I proceed to make any remarks on the above expression. David says, Psalm 89 : 1, "I will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever;" and explains it by adding, "with my mouth will I make known thy faithfulness to all generations." And well he might; for he says, verse 2, "Mercy shall be built up forever." He explains his meaning by saying, "Thy faithfulness shalt thou establish in the very heavens." Observe that, in the first of these verses, forever is thus explained in the margin, "to generation and generation." The second verse means that it should endure as the heavens, or throughout all generations. Besides, David says, Psalm 100 : 5, "For the Lord is good: his mercy is everlasting;" and adds, by way of explanation, "and his truth endureth to all generations." He adds, Psalm 103 : 17, "But the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him;" and it is again added, "and his righteousness unto children's children."

On all these texts where it is said "for his mercy endureth forever," with others of a similar nature, I shall now make a few observations. 1st. It is very evident that the mercy of God formed the burden of song to the Jews in their worship. The God of the Jews was a merciful God, slow to anger, and of great kindness. 2d. If it be true, as our orthodox friends assert, that God is as much glorified in the display of his endless wrath against the wicked as in the display of his endless mercy towards the righteous, how do they account for it that the phrase "for his wrath endureth forever" does not occur forty-two times as well as the phrase "for his mercy endureth forever"? Why have we not a Psalm in which it is

twenty-six times said, "O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good, for his wrath endureth forever"? Nor do we see what objection they could have to singing it, if God is as much glorified by the one as by the other. But supposing such a Psalm found in the Bible, and that they should sing both, would they not celebrate the endless mercy and wrath of the same God towards his own creatures? But I ask how all this could be reconciled with God's declarations that mercy rejoiceth against judgment, and that his tender mercies are over his other works? But, 3d. We would ask our orthodox brethren how they account for the extraordinary fact that it is not once said that "the wrath of the Lord endureth forever"? So far from this being once asserted, it is repeatedly and expressly denied that God's wrath endureth forever. Thus it is said, Psalm 103: 9, "He will not always chide; neither will he keep his anger forever." Again, Isai. 57: 16, "For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me and the souls which I have made." No, say our orthodox friends, they shall not fail, but shall endure the endless wrath of God. But it is again said, Jer. 3: 5, "Will he reserve his anger forever? Will he keep it to the end?" Here it is supposed that forever is to end; and hence it is said, verse 12, "For I am merciful saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger forever." And, in Lam. 3: 31, it is expressly said, "The Lord will not cast off forever." Further, David says, Psalm 85: 5, "Wilt thou be angry with us forever?" but he adds, by way of explanation, "Wilt thou draw out thine anger to all generations?" And Psalm 77: 8 says, "Is his mercy clean gone forever? Doth his promise fail for evermore?" Notice, here, that as forever and for evermore are expressions which convey to an English reader the same idea, so did the original word *olim* to the sacred writers. This appears also from other passages. It is beyond debate that it is never once said that the anger or wrath of God endureth forever. We solemnly call on

any man to produce a single instance where this is said. By what authority, then, do men in our day preach that God's wrath is to endure forever? They can produce no example from the Bible of such modes of speaking. Yea, I ask every candid man if it is possible to select words which could more clearly and emphatically deny that God's wrath endureth forever, than is done in the above passages? Granting, then, for argument's sake, that *olim*, rendered forever, expresses endless duration, and that God's wrath or anger means punishment, no language could more definitely declare that punishment is not of endless duration. Were I contending for a victory over the believers in endless punishment, it would be good policy in me to allow that *olim*, rendered forever, expresses this, and the above texts would be direct, positive proof that it is not of endless duration. Our orthodox friends, in contending for this, must perceive that their doctrine of endless punishment is overturned from its base by the above passages. But I disclaim any contention for victory. My object is to examine what is truth, and embrace it, whatever it may be; for this only can stand, or be of any real benefit to the human race. 4th. But, granting, for the sake of argument, that God's wrath was as much celebrated in the Bible as his mercy, and that the endless duration of it was as often asserted, permit me to ask, What worse could be sung of an Eastern despot, or of the Devil, allowing such a fallen angel to exist? We seriously urge our brethren who believe such a doctrine to consider if such a God can appear to any person very lovely, or is likely to be loved. None can love him but those who can persuade themselves that they are his particular favorites. And it is doubtful whether they can; for a being of this character may turn their enemy to-morrow, and pour his endless wrath upon them. All the apparent love and obedience which they pretend to pay him, it is to be feared, arises more from terror of than love to him; and, if a song of endless

mercy and endless wrath are both alike orthodox, orthodoxy must be a very singular kind of thing.

To get rid of these and other serious difficulties which might be urged, it may be said, "In all the above texts where it is denied that God's wrath endureth forever, the writers are not speaking of God's wrath in a future state of existence, but only in the present life." Well, how does this relieve the difficulties, unless it is proved from some other texts that God says his wrath shall endure forever in a future state of existence? But can this be proved? No; this very attempt to escape from the difficulties only shows the impossibility of making any escape; for, if the above texts wholly refer to the present life, how happens it that they are the only texts where forever and the wrath of God are associated, and in them it is expressly denied that his wrath does endure forever? If denied in them, and found in no other, it settles the question that God's wrath does not endure throughout all generations, far less in an eternal state of existence. But is it not rather silly to make the inspired writers say that God's wrath does not endure forever in the present life, yet contend for this in a future state, without any scripture authority? Who needed to be told that God's punishment of men in this world was not of endless duration?

5th. We come now to those texts in which *olim* is repeated, and is rendered "forever and ever." I find, then, that forever and ever is used and applied to the following things, in the following ways. David says, Psalm 119: 44, "I shall keep thy law continually, forever and ever." And, in Mic. 4: 5, "We will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and ever." And, Dan. 12: 3, "They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever and ever." And David says of God's judgments, that "they stand fast forever and ever." Psalm 111: 8. What is meant by this forever and ever, and whether it was intended to express endless duration, may be learned from the following texts.

In Jer. 7: 7, if Israel amended their ways, then, said God, "will I cause you to dwell in this place in the land that I gave to your fathers forever and ever." It is very evident, that, if forever and ever expresses endless duration of time, on the above consideration Israel were to dwell in Judea time without end. But who ever entertained such an idea? Is not the meaning evidently from generation to generation, or throughout all generations, while they continued a nation? Again, it is said, Isai. 30: 8, "Now go write it in a book, that it may be for the time to come, forever and ever." The forever and ever here is called the time to come, which time appears to be not endless duration, but simply the future generations of Israel. See the context. If time to come be a proper explanation of forever, it cannot refer to eternity, unless we think eternity time. But is not time always distinguished from eternity? What is meant by forever and ever seems plainly stated in Psalm 148: 5, 6; speaking of the host of heaven, it is said, "He commanded, and they were created. He hath also established them forever and ever." But is the host of heaven, or the sun, moon, and stars, to continue to endless duration? This must be maintained, or we must give up the idea that forever and ever expresses a proper eternity. We have seen above that forever is applied to the host of heaven; and, from the very nature of the case, forever and ever here cannot express a longer period of time. Both seem to be limited by the duration of this world. Again, God speaking, Isai. 34: 10, of his temporal judgments on all nations, particularly on Idumea, says, in highly figurative language, "The land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up forever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it forever and ever." Compare verse 17. Let it be noticed, on this text, that forever and forever and ever mean the same duration of time, and both these are explained by the phrase "from generation to generation."

But I find *olim* repeated, and rendered forever and ever, and applied to God, in the following places: In ascriptions of praise to him. Thus it is said, "Blessed be thou, Lord God of Israel, our father, forever and ever." 1 Chron. 29: 10. The same in substance is repeated in chap. 16: 36, and Neh. 9: 5. And in Psalm 145: 1, it is said, "I will bless thy name forever and ever;" and verse 2, "I will praise thy name forever and ever;" and, verse 21, "Let all flesh bless his holy name forever and ever." It is also applied to the existence of God. Thus, in Dan. 12: 7, the man clothed in linen "sware by him that liveth forever and ever;" and David says, Psalm 48: 14, "For this God is our God forever and ever." Also to God's reign. Accordingly it is said, Exod. 15: 18, "The Lord shall reign forever and ever;" and, in Psalm 10: 16, it is said, "The Lord is king forever and ever;" and, in Psalm 45: 6, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." Also to the mercy of God. Thus it is said, Psalm 52: 8, "I trust in the mercy of God forever and ever." It seems also to be applied to the Messiah: "He asked life of thee and thou gavest it him, even length of days forever and ever;" Psalm 21: 4; and 45: 17, "I will make thy name be remembered in all generations: therefore shall the people praise thee forever and ever." Now, suffer me to ask here—Does not the phrase, all generations, in the first part of this verse, explain, or express the very same thing as forever and ever, in the last part, and is it not in unison with the common explanation so often given above, where *olim* is rendered forever?

In looking back on all the texts introduced in these two sections, let the reader notice the following things. All the texts in the first show that the word *olim* expresses limited duration, and was so understood by our translators, for they render it by English words which do not convey the idea of endless duration. Again, the greater part of the passages in both sections show that the word *olim*, in whatever way rendered, was applied

by the sacred writers to things of temporary duration. This, we think, is indisputable. Again, it has been seen that *olim*, whether applied to temporary things or to God, is explained by the inspired writers to mean throughout all generations, or by some similar expression. Why give such explanations at all, if the word means endless duration? And why were they given, when God is spoken of, as well as when it expresses the duration of anything else, if it expresses his endless duration? But, again: in none of the above passages is the word *olim* used to express the duration of punishment to the wicked. All the texts where it is supposed to be used to express this, will be considered in the next section. The long detail of texts in the two preceding sections, perhaps, may appear dry and uninteresting to some readers; but it was absolutely necessary to pursue this course to come at a full and fair understanding of the scriptural meaning and general usage of the word *olim*, so variously rendered in the common version.

SECTION III.

ALL THE TEXTS WHERE OLIM OCCURS, AND IS RENDERED BY WORDS WHICH CONVEY THE IDEA OF ENDLESS DURATION, AND APPLIED TO PUNISHMENT, PARTICULARLY CONSIDERED.

In the preceding section we have seen the term *olim* rendered perpetual, everlasting, and forever, and used to express the duration of the punishment of certain places. Isai. 34 : 9—17, and Jer. 49 : 13. We are now to bring into view the texts where it is used to express the punishment of persons, in whatever way it is rendered in the common version. Jer. 23 : 39, 40, is the first we shall notice. "Therefore I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you

and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence: and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame, which shall not be forgotten." Comp. Jer. 20: 11. It has been shown, in the Inquiry into the Words Sheol, Hades, &c., that this passage refers to the punishment of the Jewish nation, and deserves no further notice here. See on 2 Thess. chap. 1, below, and on Matt. chaps. 24, 25. Indeed, few will question this.

Jer. 17: 4. "For ye have kindled a fire in mine anger, which shall burn forever." It is so evident, from verses 1—4, the prophet is speaking of the sin and punishment of Judah, and this punishment was of a temporal nature, that it would be a waste of time to offer any remarks on this passage.

Isai. 33: 14. "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites: who among us shall dwell with devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" Having considered this passage in my Inquiry into the Words Sheol, Hades, &c., to it I refer the reader for an illustration.

Psalm 9: 5. "Thou hast rebuked the heathen, thou hast destroyed the wicked, thou hast put out their name forever and ever." It would be useless to spend time in showing that this text has no reference to punishment in a future state. No sensible orthodox man would urge it, and no man who consults the context, can help seeing that it has no reference to such a subject.

Mal. 1: 4. "Whereas Edom saith, we are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the Lord of hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; and they shall call them the border of wickedness, and the people against whom the Lord hath indignation forever." The prophet is here speaking of Edom, and it is plain, from the context, that the indignation mentioned is not in a future state, but God's temporal vengeance on that people. The meaning of the passage evidently is, "The people against whom the Lord

hath indignation from generation to generation," as explained frequently in preceding sections.

Dan. 12: 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." The principal question to be considered from this passage is, Did Daniel here speak of the everlasting punishment of the wicked? If he did, he delivered it in plainer language than any other sacred writer, and in a book which contains predictions clothed in highly figurative language. Our orthodox friends do not depend much on the Old Testament for proof of the doctrine of endless misery, and as this is the strongest, yea, I may say the only text which they generally quote from it in proof, we shall give it a particular consideration.

The passage, then, says: "And at that time." At what time? The time, evidently, of which Daniel had been speaking, chap. 11. This will not be disputed, for it is plain that the first four verses of chap. 12 connect with the matters stated in the 11th chapter. The things mentioned are said to take place at the period called that time, chap. 12: 1, whatever time this may be. This time is easily ascertained from considering of what people Daniel was speaking. It is plain he referred to the Jews, for, in verse 1, they are twice called "thy people," or Daniel's people, who certainly were Jews. Let us, then, see how the events mentioned agree to Daniel's people. It is said, "and at that time," which time is called, chap. 12: 40, "the time of the end." But this provokes the question, What end? I answer, the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. Is it asked, What proof have we of this? I answer, in chap. 11: 31, "the abomination that maketh desolate" is expressly mentioned, which passage our Lord quotes, Matt. 24: 15, and applies it to the Romans, by whom the Jewish temple and city were destroyed at the end of the age. See the whole of chap. 11, for other circumstances which corroborate this. It will be shown, afterwards, that the

period called "the end," chap. 11, and "that time," chap. 12: 1, exactly agree to the end of the Jewish dispensation, which is repeatedly called "the end of the world," or age, in the New Testament. It is then said, at that time "shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people." It is difficult to say, with certainty, who was referred to by Michael; nor is this necessary to be determined in the present discussion. The most probable opinion we have seen is, that Michael, the great prince, refers to Messiah, called the prince of the Jews in other parts of the book of Daniel, and the prince of life, and prince of the kings of the earth, in other parts of Scripture. It is supposed, by Pierce and others, that certain angels presided over different parts of the world before the coming of Christ, but all of them now are put in subjection to him. During the period which preceded his coming, it is supposed he was the person who presided over the Jewish nation. But it would be aside from my present object to enter further into this question.

The passage proceeds to say: "And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time." Our Lord refers to these very words, Matt. 24: 21, and applies them to the great tribulations which came on the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple at the end of the age. "For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no nor ever shall be. And except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved." Who can doubt, after reading this, that Daniel referred to the end of the age, and the tribulations which came on the Jewish nation? He could refer to no other, unless it can be proved that there have been two different times of such calamity that the like had never been since there was a nation, or from the beginning of the world. We think this conclusively shows to what period, to what people, and to what calamities the prophet referred.

It is further said, "And at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book." It is not said, all Daniel's people shall be delivered "at that time," but only such as were found "written in the book." What is meant by being blotted out of a book, or not found written in it, we may learn from Exodus 32: 32, 33, and compare Rev. 20: 15. On the contrary, what is meant by being found written in a book, may be learned from Phil. 4: 3, and Rev. 13: 8. Compare Isai. 4: 3, and Luke 10: 20. I shall only quote the following passages, which are a sufficient illustration of this phraseology. "Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous." Psalm 69: 28. By consulting this Psalm, any one may see David referred to the unbelieving Jews, who were the murderers of our Lord, for it is quoted in the New Testament and applied to them. It is implied that the righteous are written in a book, and it is evident, also, that to be blotted out "of the book of the living," or "not to be written with the righteous," are synonymous expressions. Who, then, were the righteous, written in the book, distinguished from the unbelieving Jews, not written with the righteous? What persons could they be but our Lord's disciples? This, in the first place, agrees to the fact; for they were all delivered from the calamities which came on the Jewish nation at the end of the age. They left the city, according to our Lord's directions, Matt. 24, and went to a city called Pella, as shown by Macknight on that chapter. Second. It is in agreement with the prediction of Malachi, and the language he uses in reference to Christ's disciples, and also the unbelieving Jews. Concerning the former, "a book of remembrance was written," chap. 3: 16, and they were spared as a man spareth his only son which serveth him. Concerning the latter, they were to be as stubble. See the description given of them at length in Malachi, chaps. 3, 4. The peculiar phraseology about being written in a book, is in allusion to the ancient practice of

making record at courts, of any good service any one had done, as may be seen by consulting Esther 6 : 1, 2, and 2 : 23. This part of the passage, then, perfectly agrees with Scripture, and with the facts of the case.

Let us now attend to verse 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." That no literal resurrection of the dead took place at the destruction of Jerusalem needs no proof, and it has been shown that Daniel refers to this period. What, then, is the prophet's meaning? The phrase "everlasting life" occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament. It is a phrase familiar to the New Testament writers, and, if borrowed from the Old, must have been taken from this place in Daniel. It could not refer to the happiness of heaven, as people generally suppose, but to that life of happiness enjoyed by the disciples of our Lord, who were found written in the book, as the time and events mentioned, verse 1, show. Besides, it is set in contrast to the shame and everlasting contempt suffered by those not found written in the book, and which came on the Jews in the destruction of their city and temple, and which they are still as a nation enduring. It is obvious that, in scripture style, life is used to express glory, honor, and happiness, as could easily be shown. At the period referred to, verse 1, many awoke to the honor and happiness of our Lord's kingdom, or reign, which consists in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. So did many to the shame and contempt which came on the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation. The term everlasting is applied to both, and can occasion no difficulty to any one who has attended to the Old Testament usage of this word, as shown in the preceding sections. It is objected, "How could any believer enjoy everlasting life, or any one endure shame and everlasting contempt, if these are confined to this world? Must not both be carried into another world to be everlasting?" We answer this by asking, Must not the chil-

dren of Israel and the land of Canaan, then, be carried into a future state, that they may enjoy this land for "an endless possession"? And must not the servant whose ear was pierced go into another world, if he would serve his master forever? And must not Aaron and his sons, with the whole Levitical service, go into another world, that they may enjoy the priesthood forever? In fact, instances without number may be adduced to show the absurdity of such an objection, and of such a mode of reasoning on the word everlasting.

It is agreeable to fact, that, on the day of Pentecost, three thousand Jews awoke to the everlasting life imparted by the gospel by believing in Jesus. Such, also, was the case with multitudes, as the history of the Acts of the Apostles shows. Though the spirit of slumber had seized the Jewish nation, though they had eyes, and saw not, and ears, but heard not, yet the apostle declares that there was a remnant according to the election of grace. See Rom. 11. This part awoke to everlasting life, or entered into the everlasting kingdom of Christ, and had peace and joy in believing. They heard the voice of the Son of God, and lived. Compare Eph. 5: 14. The rest slept on till the wrath of God came upon them to the uttermost. They awoke, but it was to shame and everlasting contempt, in being dispersed among all nations, and have become a by-word and a hissing even unto this day. Jeremiah, in chap. 23: 39, 40, predicted this very punishment, and calls it an everlasting reproach, and a perpetual shame. That the life or happiness enjoyed by believers in the kingdom of Jesus Christ is called everlasting life in the New Testament, we shall afterwards show.

After what has been said, we shall only glance at verses 3, 4. "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." It is a sufficient illustration of this verse to quote our Lord's words, Matt. 13: 43, "Then shall the righteous shine

forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." See, on this whole context, Section VI., below. Compare Matt. 24 : 13 and Luke 21 : 28. And is not Dan. 11 : 31—36, descriptive of this very time and events, of the Jews generally, and of our Lord's disciples, when God's judgments came on that guilty nation? In the margin of the verse we are considering it is rendered, "And they that be teachers shall shine as the brightness of the firmament." How applicable this was to the apostles and first teachers of Christianity, needs no comment, for the teachers of the seven churches of Asia are called stars, Rev. 1 : 20. And who doubts that the apostles and first teachers shall shine in giving light forever and ever, or, as we have seen this phrase explained, "throughout all generations"?

Let us now glance at verse 4, and dismiss this passage. "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." No man, we think, can doubt that the time of the end, to which Daniel was to shut up the words and seal the book, was the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. The preceding verses show that to this time he did refer; and it is frequently called the end in the New Testament. See 1 Cor. 10 : 11; Heb. 9 : 26; and other passages. See particularly Matt. 24 : 3, where the disciples ask our Lord, "What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world, or age?" But notice what is said, verse 14, to show that many should run to and fro and knowledge should be increased before this end came. "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." Before the end came, or the destruction of Jerusalem, the sound of the apostles' doctrine had gone out into all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. These things, and many others which I must omit, show that Daniel here, and our Lord, Matt. 24, speak of the same people, the same time, and

the same events. The whole of this passage is illustrated by our Lord's words, John 5: 28, 26, an explanation of which we have given in the Universalist Magazine, vol. vii. pp. 103—7. To it we refer our readers, as our limits forbid its insertion.

Such are all the places in the Old Testament where *olim* is used, in whatever way rendered in the common version, and applied by the sacred writers. Reserving my principal remarks on the use of this word to the last section, I would only observe here —

1st. That though this word is often used in the Old Testament, as my readers have seen, and expresses duration in a variety of ways, yea, is used to express the duration of punishment in a few instances, yet it is not once used to designate any punishment beyond this mortal existence. All the passages where it is applied to punishment have been distinctly noticed; and Dan. 12: 1—4 has been particularly considered, which is the only text in the Old Testament on which the doctrine of eternal punishment could possibly be built. Our orthodox friends may be ashamed for having made such a mighty noise about their doctrine of eternal misery, and ought to make a public apology to the world for their conduct. The better informed among them have conceded that this doctrine is not taught in the Old Testament, nor could any of them continue to believe it, if they could only be induced to examine the subject.

2d. If *olim* is so often used in the Old Testament, and is sometimes used to express the duration of punishment, yet is never used to express the duration of punishment beyond this state of existence, when and how came the doctrine of everlasting punishment after death to be known among men? In the First Part we have shown its origin to be human. If our orthodox brethren still venture to assert that its origin is divine, it is their work to show this. Its claims for our belief, from the New Testament, I shall now proceed to examine.

SECTION IV.

GENERAL REMARKS ON AION AND AIONIOS, AS USED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

MOST lexicon writers assert that *aion*, and the adjective *aionios*, are used to express an endless duration of time, though all of them admit that they are also used to express a limited period. From this very fact have arisen long and violent contentions, whether these words, when used to express the duration of punishment, are to be understood in a limited or unlimited sense. Lexicons are not infallible, nor were they intended to determine, but only to assist us in ascertaining, the true meaning of scripture words. The words were used and understood long before lexicons had any existence. Whilst we ought to avail ourselves of their assistance, yet every man ought to examine for himself, from their general usage, the context of the places, and other circumstances, if the senses of words given by them be correct. To receive implicitly what they say, is only to perpetuate their errors, if the writers have inadvertently or intentionally committed any.

It is universally allowed, by all competent judges, of whatever sect, that *aion* and *aionios* are frequently used to express a limited duration of time. Parkhurst says, *aion* "denotes duration or continuance of time, but with great variety." Ewing says it signifies "duration, finite or infinite; a period of duration, past or future; an age, duration of the world, Deut. 32: 7, Luke 1: 70; plural, ages of the world, 1 Cor. 2: 7; hence, human life in this world, Luke 16: 8; or the next, Mark 10: 30; our manner of life in the world, Psalm 90: 8, Eph. 2: 2: an age of divine dispensation, the ages, generally reckoned three — that before the law, that under the law, and that under the Messiah, Matt. 24: 3, and 28: 20, 1 Cor. 10: 11, Heb. 11: 3; by faith, we understand that the ages

were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are (now) seen did not arise out of things which did (previously) appear; compare verses 1, 7, 26, 27; an indefinitely long period of time; hence eternity, Exod. 14: 13, Luke 1: 55, John 4: 14, Psalm 19: 9, Gal. 1: 5, Rev. 20: 10; from eternity to eternity, 1 Chron. 29: 10, Psalm 90: 2." On the word *aionios*, Ewing says it signifies "eternal, Exod. 3: 14, 15, Matt. 25: 46, Rom. 16: 26; *chronoi aionoi*, ages of the world, periods of the dispensations since the world began, Rom. 16: 25." See Parkhurst for a similar explanation, but let the reader examine their proofs.

The word *aion* is compounded of *aei*, always, and *on*, being; which is interpreted, by Parkhurst and others, "always being." Yet, he says, "it denotes duration, or continuance of time, but with great variety"! He allows that *aei*, always, signifies "ever, in a restrained sense, that is, at some stated times, very frequently, continually." Acts 7: 51, and 2 Cor. 6: 10, to which he refers as proof of its meaning ever in an unrestrained sense, do not prove this point; for surely the Jews did not eternally resist the Spirit of God, nor did the apostle mean that he rejoiced eternally. Its sense seems evidently to be perseveringly, but not endless in duration. Had Parkhurst found any texts more to his purpose, no doubt but he would have quoted them. All the texts where he thinks *aion* means a proper eternity will be considered in their place.

It is a remark which has often been made that the adjective *aionios* cannot signify more than the noun from whence it is derived; for, if the latter only expresses limited duration, the former cannot express endless. A stream cannot rise higher than its fountain without mechanical force; nor can *aionios* express a longer duration than *aion* without a forced construction of meaning. Though Parkhurst asserts that it means "eternal, having neither beginning nor end," yet he allows that it signifies "the ages of the world, the times

since the beginning of its existence;" and adds, "the Seventy frequently use this adjective for the Hebrew *oulem*." But, from an examination of the texts in the Old Testament where this word occurs, the reader can judge if anything conclusive can be drawn from it as expressing endless duration. From an examination of all the texts where it is used to express the duration of punishment, we think it proved that it does not express endless duration, nor does it even refer to punishment in a future state of existence. Whether *aionios*, its corresponding word in the New, does this, we shall see when we come to consider the passages in which it occurs. If it did, the one word certainly does not correspond to the other; for there is an inconceivable difference between limited and endless duration. All this difference is added, by the New Testament writers, to the word *aionios*, if it expresses the eternity of punishment. It has been said that *aionios*, when it stands alone, signifies duration without end. But how can it stand alone? For, if an adjective, it must have some noun, either expressed or understood, with which it is connected, and which it qualifies. If a man should say "Eternal," the question would immediately be asked him, "Eternal what?" If he meant to be understood, he would inform us what thing he considered to be eternal; such as, eternal God, eternal life, eternal punishment. It is the noun, then, or the thing to which this word is applied, which must determine the extent of duration expressed by it; and if *aion*, from which it is derived, does not express endless duration, but an age, how can the adjective express a longer duration, unless we say the word derived contains more than that from which it is derived; or the stream contains more, or rises higher, than the fountain? Allowing it to be applied to God, who is without beginning or end, what does this prove? Can this make God so, or does it fix the meaning of this word as expressing endless duration? Not unless we say words expressing a limited time cannot possibly be applied to him; or, if applied, must de-

rive an unlimited, yea, infinite, sense from such an application. Our orthodox friends would not reason so in other cases. The terms good and great are adjectives, and are applied to God; but do they contend that they are to be always understood in an infinite sense, or expressing an infinite degree when so applied? Surely not; for how could they, in this case, maintain their doctrine of infinite, endless misery, seeing it is said, "The Lord is good unto all," and that "great is his mercy"?

But, again, the words are used in the plural number. But how can words capable of being used plurally signify a proper eternity? For eternity is one; eternities are never spoken of. People speak of eternity to come, and eternity past, but still it is only one uninterrupted, endless continuance. The past eternity had no beginning; nor had it an end when the future eternity began; for, in this view, it could not be a proper eternity, as it had an end. In fact, we cannot form a distinct, definite idea of eternity; for, if this could be done, we must either be finite ourselves or necessarily limit it.

In our English version I find *aion* rendered seven times never, once course, twice ages, thirty-seven times world, once without end, once eternal, twice ever, sixty-six times forever, and four times for evermore. In several places it occurs twice in the same text. The adjective *aionios* I find is rendered three times world, once forever, forty-one times eternal, and twenty-four times everlasting. As forever, eternal and everlasting, are English words which convey the same idea, it is unnecessary to make any distinction in introducing the passages where they occur, whether the translation of *aion* or *aionios*. In rendering *aion* and *aionios* in the New Testament, our translators have given us considerable variety as they did in rendering *olim* in the Old Testament. In only two instances, however, have they rendered them by the word age or ages. But many translations of the New Testament have been made since, where age is given as a better rendering of these words.

It is, I believe, now generally agreed by critics and commentators, both orthodox and otherwise, that age ought to be the rendering of this word in a variety of places, some of which shall be noticed in their place.

It is universally allowed that *aion* and *aionios* are the words used in the Seventy's version in rendering the Hebrew word *olim*. A very slight inspection of this version will satisfy any one of its truth. It is well known that our Lord and his apostles quoted the Seventy's version. And Mr. Stuart observes, that although "the New Testament was written in Greek, yet its idiom is Hebrew." He calls it the Hebrew Greek of the New Testament. Indeed, the longer I study the two Testaments I am the more convinced, that in understanding the phraseology of the New, we must recur to the Old Testament for our explanations. The translators of our common version have rendered these Hebrew and Greek words, generally, by the same English words, such as, world, everlasting, eternal, forever, and forever and ever. This is the case, whether the words are applied to God, or to punishment, in the Old or New Testaments; nor is it intimated that the original words, or the words by which they are rendered, have a more vague and indefinite meaning in the former than they have in the latter. To an English reader, everlasting and forever are the same in both Testaments. If everlasting punishment is not taught in the Old Testament, it is not for want of as definite a word to express it as is found in the New.

It is admitted by some that the Old Testament is silent on the subject of endless punishment, yet they contend that it is taught in the New, and that *aion* and *aionios* are the words used to express its duration. But why admit the former, and contend for the latter? In both Testaments punishment is mentioned, and in both everlasting and forever are applied to it. If it is found in one it ought to be found in both. Is it rational to suppose that a doctrine of so much importance should be concealed for so many ages? How can this be reconciled with the

divine character? Was this the mystery which was kept hid from ages, and from generations, but is now revealed to us by the apostles? No New Testament writer intimates that punishment under the old dispensation was only temporary in its duration, but under the new was endless. All the scripture writers speak of punishment in the same way, express its duration in similar language; nor would their readers suppose that the New Testament writers were believers in endless misery, and those of the Old not. It is generally allowed that the punishments threatened under the Old Testament were all of a temporal nature. The question may then be asked, whether this is not a mistaken view of the Old Testament punishments. That it is not, seems obvious from all the instances mentioned, and also from no other kind of punishment being recognized in the New, when the punishments under that dispensation are referred to. The New Testament, like the Old, speaks frequently of punishment. It will then be necessary to examine with care all the texts in the New, where *aion* and *aionios* are rendered eternal, everlasting, or forever, and applied to punishment. Is it not possible that men may have been mistaken in affirming that the punishments under the Christian dispensation are carried beyond death, and are of endless duration? May they not be temporal, as under the Mosaic dispensation; and why cannot the words eternal, everlasting, or forever, be applied to them, yet not endless in duration, just as well as to those under that dispensation? Christians do not seem to think of any punishment in this life for disobedience to God. No; it is all carried into a future state of existence, and considered to be endless. But surely the New Testament writers speak of punishments, and very awful punishments, in this life. Nor do they say that under the new dispensation an eternal punishment awaited any in a future state of existence, but did not under the old dispensation. The places in the New Testament, where the words eternal, everlasting, or forever, are applied to

punishment, are few in number. If they were even many, what could this certainly prove? for we have seen such words applied to things, and even to punishment of persons, under the former dispensation, where all allow endless duration was not expressed by them.

It has been asserted that the truth or falsehood of the doctrine of endless misery depends on the meaning of *aion* and *aionios* in the New Testament, and that this subject was reduced to a matter of verbal criticism. But why ought not its truth to depend as much on the meaning of *olim* in the Old Testament, which is rendered everlasting and forever, as those words are in the New? It is a capricious mode of interpretation to give this language a limited signification in the one case and not in the other also. The truth is, something besides the mere application of the word everlasting to punishment must appear, to prove it of endless duration, for no man can deny that it is applied to punishment when no one thinks endless duration was meant. Besides, the word everlasting being so frequently applied to temporary things shows that no great dependence is to be placed on such an argument.

One of the most plausible arguments arising from everlasting being applied to punishment in the New Testament is that in Matt. 25: 46, where the same word is applied both to life and punishment, and that if the one is not endless neither is the other. But permit me here only to remark, Why does not this equally apply to Dan. 12: 2, where a case of the same kind is found? We have there shown that everlasting does not refer to endless duration of either happiness or punishment, or to anything beyond this state of existence. When we come to consider Matt. 25: 46, we shall see that this is a comment on Dan. 12: 2, and that both refer to the same everlasting punishment and happiness.

When people end the Old Testament, they seem to forget that the New is the revelation of the same God addressed originally to the Jews; that it was written by Jews, and that its ideas and language are borrowed from

Moses and the prophets. The writers adopt the words, phrases, and idioms, used in the Old Testament, as well as quote formally from it. Dr. Campbell assures us that our Lord and his apostles spoke to the Jews in the dialect of their own Scriptures, and used words and phrases with which they were familiar; and Mr. Stuart calls their writings the Hebrew-Greek of the New Testament. If we would understand this book, we must not sit down to it as Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists or Universalists, but as Jews. The question is not, What sense do any of these sects put on the words, phrases, and idioms which are found in it? but, In what sense were they understood among Jews from their own Scriptures? Is it asked, How are we to know this? I answer, from the Old Testament, from whence the New Testament writers borrowed them. The Old Testament is our dictionary of the language of the New, for the writers spake, not in the words which man teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth. While the New Testament is interpreted by sectarian dictionaries, how can Christians ever come to be agreed? Can anything else be expected but bitter contentions among them? The meaning and extent of the words and phrases to come before us were well understood among the Jews. It is to be no concern of mine how any sect now understands them, nor how I have formerly understood them myself; but how were they understood by the Jews, or what is their current sense in their sacred books. I am to consider myself, and the reader ought to consider himself, as living eighteen hundred years ago, as being born and brought up a Jew; as familiar with the Old Testament; habituated to words, phrases, and idioms of language common among the Jews; and, in fact, as far as possible to enter into the feelings, habits of thinking, and even the prejudices of that wonderful people.

New Testament usage of a word or phrase is another very important rule of which we shall avail ourselves in interpreting the passages which shall be brought before

us. For example, in Matt. 24: 3, we have the phrase "the end of the world." Now, if this phrase does not mean here the end of this natural world, but the end of the Jewish age, we think it ought to have the same meaning in other places, unless the subject and scope of the writer entirely forbid it. When I therefore come to this phrase, or others in the course of this investigation, all the places in which such phrases are found will be brought forward at once and considered. This will save the repetition of remark, and will enable the reader to form a more correct judgment of the true scripture meaning of such phrases. Besides, if any inspired writer uses a word or phrase, and its sense is ascertained, if he uses it again, or repeatedly, it ought to be understood in the same sense, unless he by some way shows us he is to be differently understood. This is nothing more than every writer or speaker is entitled to, whom we wish to treat with common civility. If he uses it in another book, or if it is used by other sacred writers, our means of ascertaining its true sense are increased.

Much misunderstanding of the Scriptures has arisen from our overlooking what some may think but trifling circumstances. For example, some seldom take into view the writer, the time when he wrote, or the circumstances in which he was placed. They also overlook the persons to whom he addressed himself, the circumstances in which they were placed, and the subject on which he discourses to them. The scope and drift of his discourse from the context is seldom considered. Hence words, phrases, and verses are quoted to prove what was never thought of by him. His words are quoted, and a sense affixed to them agreeable to the religious creeds of the persons, which, if the context was consulted, would clearly show their mistake, and that, though unintentionally, they were perverting the Scriptures. We also may err, and fail in what we propose, but we shall at least make the attempt. Infallibility is no article of our creed; we would only do all in our power to produce a correct

understanding of the Scriptures, without which, endless division and debate must exist among Christians.

SECTION V.

ALL THE PLACES NOTICED, WHERE AION AND AIONIOS ARE RENDERED AGES, COURSE, NEVER, FOREVER, EVERMORE, ETERNAL, EVERLASTING; BUT WHICH HAVE NO RELATION TO PUNISHMENT.

THE word *aion* is rendered ages, in the common version, in the following places. Eph. 2: 7, "That in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace." It would have been absurd to have rendered it here, "that in the eternities to come." Nor would it have sounded well to have said, "that in the worlds to come;" for the question might have been asked, Pray how many eternities or worlds are to come? Our translators, then, not only own that this word signifies age, but were compelled to render it so in this passage. Again, Col. 1: 26, "Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations." The remarks on the last text equally apply here. It would not have done to have said, "Even the mystery which hath been hid from generations," for the term generations is used immediately after in the passage. Macknight on this text, says, "'The mystery which was kept hid from the ages and from the generations.' In the parallel passage, Eph. 3: 5, it is, 'Which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apostles.' So likewise Romans 16: 25, 'The mystery which hath been kept secret,' *chronois aioniois*, in the times of the ages, or during the Mosaic dispensation. For the meaning of the words mystery, and ages, see Eph. 1: 9; also Titus 1: 2. Though the salvation of mankind by faith was promised

in the covenant with Abraham, and spoken of by the prophets, it was not understood by the Jews, see Eph. 3: 5, and therefore it is here called a mystery, or thing kept secret, in allusion to the heathen mysteries."

I shall also quote the following from Pierce on this passage, as it sheds general light on this whole subject. "'The mystery which hath been hid from ages and generations.' The expression of *to mysterion to apokekrymmenon apo ton aionon*, is rendered by our translators, Eph. 3: 9, "the mystery hid from the beginning of the world;" but it is manifest from this place, where it is joined with *apo ton geneon*, that it is rightly translated here hid from ages, and that it ought to have been so translated in that place also. The same thing is meant when he speaks of the "revelation of the mystery," which we translate, kept "secret since the world began;" but Mr. Locke better renders it "in the secular times," that is, the times under the law. I shall here transcribe his remark upon the words, Rom. 16: 25, because it gives much light to this matter. 'Why the times under the law were called *chronoi aionioi* we may find a reason in their jubilees, which were *aiones*, *sæcula*, or ages, by which all the time under the law was measured; and so *chronon aionion* is used, 2 Tim. 1: 9, Tit. 1: 2. And so *aiones* are put for the times of the law, or the jubilees, Luke 1: 70; Acts 3: 21; 1 Cor. 2: 7; 10: 11; Eph. 3: 9; Col. 1: 26; Heb. 9: 26. And so God is called the rock, *aionon*, of ages, Isai. 26: 4, in the same sense that he is called the rock of Israel, Isai. 30: 29, that is, the strength and support of the Jewish state; for it is of the Jews the prophet here speaks. So Exod. 21: 6, *eiston aiona*, signifies, not as we translate it, *forever*, but *to the jubilee;* which will appear if we compare Lev. 25: 39—41, and Exod. 21: 2. Now that the times of the law were the times spoken of here by St. Paul, seems plain from that which he declares to have continued a mystery during all those times, namely, God's purpose of taking in the Gentiles to be his people

under the Messiah; for this could not be said to be a mystery at any other time, but during the time that the Jews were the peculiar people of God, separated to him from among the nations of the earth. Before that time there was no such name or notion of distinction, as Gentiles. Before the days of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the calling of the Israelites to be God's peculiar people, was as much a mystery, as the calling of others out of other nations was a mystery afterwards. All that St. Paul insists on here, and in all the places where he mentions this mystery, is to show, that though God had declared this his purpose to the Jews, by the predictions of his prophets among them, yet it lay concealed from their knowledge—it was a mystery to them—they understood no such thing; there was not anywhere the least suspicion or thought of it, till the Messiah being come, it was declared by St. Paul to the Jews and Gentiles, and made out by the writings of the prophets which were now understood.'"

Aion is rendered "course," Eph. 2: 2, "Wherein in time past, ye walked according to the course of this world." Macknight says, "Chandler observes that the Greek word *aion*, and the Latin *avum*, which corresponds to it, signify the life of man; and, by an easy figure, the manner of a man's living." That *olim*, in the Old Testament, often signifies a man's lifetime, has been seen. And *aionion* signifies the lifetime of Onesimus, Phile. 15. See Macknight on this verse.

The Greek phrase, *eis ton aiona*, occurs in the following texts, and is rendered in our version "never." John 4: 14, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst." And, 8: 51, "If a man keep my saying he shall never see death." See also verse 52. In chap. 10: 28, it is said, "They shall never perish," referring to Christ's sheep. And, 11: 26, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." And 13: 8, Peter said to Jesus, "Thou shalt never wash my feet." Dr. Campbell, in his note on John 9: 32, says,

concerning the phrases *ek tou aionos* and *eis ton aiona*, "But, in popular language, the former often denotes no more than from the beginning of the world, or even from very early times; and *eis ton aiona* does not always mean to eternity, in the strict sense of the word. That the use is nearly the same in the Pagan writers, has been very well shown by Wetstein."

The same Greek phrase, *eis ton aiona*, is rendered in the following passages "forever." In Matt. 21: 19, it is said of the fig-tree, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward forever." See, also, Mark 11: 14. In Luke 1: 55 it is said, "As he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed forever." And John 6: 51, "If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever." See, also, verse 58. And, 8: 35, "And the servant abideth not in the house forever; but the son abideth ever." John 12: 34, "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth forever." And, 14: 16, "He shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever." Heb. 5: 6, "Thou art a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." And, 6: 20, and 7: 17, 21, where the same is repeated. Verse 24, "But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood." Verse 28, "But the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the son who was consecrated for evermore." 1 Peter 1: 23, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." And, 1 John, 2: 17, "But he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." And 2 John 2, "For the truth's sake which dwelleth in us, and shall be with us forever." See some other texts below, where this phrase is differently rendered, and is used to express the duration of punishment.

On all these texts, where this phrase, *eis ton aiona*, occurs, we would remark, that it is used in a similar sense as *olim* in the Old Testament, where it is said of certain cities, that they should be an heap, or a desolation forever; such as the example of the fig-tree, which

passage Dr. Campbell renders, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward." It is also used to express the period of a man's lifetime, as in the Old Testament. The servant or slave may be sold, or the year of release may set him free, but the son abideth forever, or all his days. And whoever compares John 14: 16 with verses 1—5, and with verse 12, may see reason to think that our Lord's meaning was, The comforter I shall send you will not, like me, leave you before you die, but will continue to be with you all your days. Was not this the way Christ was to fulfil his promise, Matt. 28: 20, in being with his disciples unto the end of the world or age? See on this text below. Besides, when Paul said he would eat no flesh while the world standeth, did he mean anything more than all the days of his life? In this sense Macknight understands him. I would merely suggest it for consideration, if his meaning is not, I will eat no flesh while the age or Jewish dispensation endures, which was then vanishing away. I should think the above Greek phrase, is also used, as in the Old Testament, to signify throughout your generations. Such seems to be its sense in Luke 1: 55, and also where the word of the Lord is said to endure forever, 1 Peter 1: 23, 25, and comp. Heb. 9: 14. But, to see what is the meaning of the phrase, see the Seventy's version, from whence it is taken. *Eis ton aiona* is the rendering there of *olim* in a vast number of instances, which it would be tedious to enumerate. See the quotation from Pierce, on Col. 1: 26, above.

The phrase, *eis tous aionas*, is used in the following places, and is rendered forever and for evermore. Matt. 6: 13, "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever." Luke 1: 33, "And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." Rom. 1: 25, "And served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever." Rom. 9: 5, "Who is over all God blessed forever." And, 11: 36, "To whom be glory forever." And, 16: 27, "To God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ

forever." 2 Cor. 11: 31, "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is blessed for evermore." Heb. 13: 8, "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever." Comp. 1 Tim. 6: 16. In the following texts, the phrase *eis tous aionas* occurs, and is joined with *ton aionon*, and rendered "forever and ever," in ascriptions of praise to God and to Christ. Thus, for example, Gal. 1: 5, "To whom be glory forever and ever." The same for substance is repeated in the following texts, which it is unnecessary to quote. Philip. 4: 20; 2 Tim. 4: 18; Heb. 13: 21; 1 Peter 4: 11, and 5: 11; Rev. 1: 6, 18; 4: 9, 10; 5: 13, 14; 7: 12; 10: 6; 11: 15; 14: 11; 15: 7; 19: 3; 20: 10, and 22: 5. It occurs also in 1 Tim. 1: 17, in an ascription of praise to God, which I shall quote, as it requires some notice. "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever." When God is here said to be the "King eternal," most people think the apostle meant to describe the endless duration of the divine being. But on this text let us hear Macknight, who thus writes: "Now to the King eternal. Perhaps *to de baisilei ton aionon* may be better translated, to the king of the ages, namely, the age before the law, the age under the law, and the age under the Messiah. According to this translation, which is perfectly literal, the apostle's meaning is, To him who hath governed the three dispensations under which mankind have lived, so as to make them coöperate to the same great end, the pardoning of sinners, and who is immortal, etc., be honor, and glory forever, ascribed by angels and men." There is no cause for alarm with good people, that these views are attempting to do away the eternal duration of God; for surely his endless existence is independent of the meaning of a Greek word, whether you give it a limited or an unlimited signification. Besides, in this very passage he is called the "immortal (*aftharto*) God." In some copies it is the *athanato*, or undying God. No one can doubt

that Macknight's rendering is a literal, correct one. The apostle is then rendering praise to God, who is king throughout all the ages, that before the law, under the law, and the age also of the Messiah. This king purposed an eternal purpose, Eph. 3: 11, which Macknight thus renders, "According to the disposition of the ages, which he made for Christ Jesus our Lord." See his whole note on Eph. 3: 11, part of which I shall only quote. "*Aion*, age, is a word of various signification. Here, in the plural, it denotes the dispensations of religion under which mankind have been placed; namely, the Patriarchal, in which a Saviour was promised; the Mosaical, in which he was typified; and the Christian, in which he was manifested in the flesh, and preached to the world, as come. All these ages or dispensations, the apostle saith, God planned and brought to pass for the sake of Christ Jesus; that is, to prepare mankind for his reception. Rom. 16: 25; Tit. 1: 2 (see the note on that verse), *chronoi aionioi* signifies the ages of the law, or Mosaic dispensation. And Eph. 3: 9; Col. 1: 26, *aiones* signifies the Jews, living under that dispensation."

There are a few more texts in which the words everlasting and eternal occur, to which we shall now pay some attention, in connection with these quotations. When God is called the king of the ages, the question occurs, What ages? According to Ewing and others, the answer is, the age before the law, the Mosaic age, and the age of the Messiah. The king of the ages, then, disposed or appointed the ages for Christ Jesus. Before the Mosaic age, a promise of life was given in Christ Jesus, Tit. 1: 2. This we shall see more fully afterwards. It was promised to our first parents; also to Abraham, that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. This was done during the patriarchal age. During the Mosaic age, the law was added to the promise until the seed should come. Many things connected with this dispensation, we have seen,

were called everlasting, but, having answered the purpose for which they were added to the promise, have vanished away. The age of the Messiah succeeded it, but it is to be succeeded by no other. When the end of it comes, Christ is to deliver up the kingdom to God the Father, which appears to be at the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. 15: 24—29. Several things, during the reign or kingdom of Messiah, in this age, are called everlasting or forever. His kingdom is called "the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." 2 Peter 1: 11. And surely it may be called so, with more propriety than many things under the Mosaic age or dispensation, for this kingdom is not to be superseded by another taking its place, for when it closes it is said, "then cometh the end."

The gospel is called "the everlasting gospel preached to the nations." Rev. 14: 6. But why? Because it shall be preached as long as the kingdom of the Messiah shall continue, which shall be to the period called the end. Hence it is said, "The word of the Lord endureth forever." 1 Peter 1: 23. And Christ promised that the Spirit or Comforter should abide with his disciples forever, and is called the eternal Spirit. Heb. 9: 14. Some copies, however, only read Holy Spirit. Such as believe the everlasting gospel, and enter into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, receive everlasting consolation and good hope through grace. 2 Thess. 2: 16. Or, as Macknight says, "that is, the means of never-failing consolation." To be so highly honored is thus expressed by Peter, 1 Epistle 5: 10. "The God of all grace, who hath called us unto his eternal glory by Christ Jesus." Let it be observed that eternal glory is not said to be a future thing, but that to which Peter says they were already called. They receive the promise of eternal inheritance. Heb. 9: 16. If the land of Canaan was given to Israel, and called an everlasting inheritance, as it often is in the Old Testament, how much more might the inheritance in the kingdom of Jesus

Christ bestowed, on Christians, be called an eternal inheritance? It should be recollected that the apostle was writing to Hebrews, to whom such language was familiar. Besides, this, we shall afterwards see, is the same that our Lord calls enjoying eternal life in the world to come. And is it not the same that Paul calls inheriting the kingdom of God and of Christ? 1 Cor. 6: 9, 10; Gal. 5: 21.

The new covenant, like the covenants under the Mosaic age, is called everlasting. And surely it may be called so, for it is not to vanish away, and give place to a new and better covenant, like that of the old. Christ's blood was that by which this new covenant was confirmed, and is called the blood of the everlasting covenant, Heb. 13: 20. Having purged his people, not as under the law with the blood of goats and calves, "but by his own blood, he entered in once unto the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption." Heb. 9: 12. "And being made perfect through suffering, became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." Heb. 5: 9. Christ's salvation is called a great salvation, Heb. 2: 3, probably in reference to other salvations which God wrought for ancient Israel. And here it is called eternal in the same comparative sense, for God wrought many salvations for them. This salvation was abiding. Comp. Luke 1: 74, 75. Is it asked, Salvation from what? I answer, not from hell and endless misery, for this is nowhere said in Scripture, but from sin and death, which Christ shall finally accomplish. See 1 Cor. 15.

In 2 Peter 3: 18, we have the following ascription of praise. "To whom be glory both now and forever." The Greek here is *eis hemerau ai nios*. Macknight says this is "unto the day of eternity." But how can this be, for what has eternity to do with days? Besides, how does this agree to some quotations made from him respecting *aion*, which he says means an age? We should say the text simply says, "To him be glory both now and unto the day of the age." Some copies have it, "unto

the age of ages," similar to passages noticed above. We should think the duration expressed is "during the age of the Messiah." Luke 16: 9. "That when ye fail they may receive you into everlasting habitations." Dr. Campbell says, "The epithet unrighteous, here applied to mammon or riches, does not imply acquired by injustice or any undue means; but, in this application, it denotes false riches, that is, deceitful, not to be relied on." Well, does not the epithet everlasting, applied to habitations, mean stable and satisfactory? See on Psalm 49: 11, and on 2 Thess. 2: 16, and other texts above. But as it is applied, not to punishment, but to happiness, it requires no further attention.

2 Cor. 4: 17, 18, and 5: 1, I shall quote together. "For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal. For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." In these verses, glory is contrasted with affliction, weight of glory with light affliction, and a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory with affliction which is but for a moment. Besides, things which are not seen are contrasted with things which are seen; and the eternal duration of things not seen with the temporary duration of things which are seen; and an house not made with hands is contrasted with the house of this tabernacle; and the house not made with hands eternal in the heavens, with the earthly house of this tabernacle. But, notice, the duration of these things is said to be in the heavens, and we think could be shown, from the context, to refer to that state of things after the resurrection, when mortality is swallowed up of life, verse 4. See the whole context, and a paper in volume 7 of the Universalist Magazine on verse 10. The idea conveyed

by the word eternal, in all these verses, seems to be the stability of the things of that state compared to those of the present. Though the idea of their endless duration is included, yet the apostle's object seems to be more their stability than their endless duration. But, as these passages have no relation to punishment, it is unnecessary to enter into further remarks, except to say, that the same or similar things are not said in regard to the punishment of any after the dissolution of their earthly tabernacle. This we shall see in Section VII., where all the passages are considered in which eternal is applied to punishment.

SECTION VI.

ALL THE PLACES WHERE AION AND AIONIOS ARE RENDERED WORLD, CONSIDERED.

I FIND the Greek phrase, *eis ton aiona*, rendered "world," 1 Cor. 8: 13. "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no meat while the world standeth." Here the same Greek phrase is rendered "world," which, we have seen, is rendered never, forever, and for evermore. And why is it so rendered here? Because, it would not do to say, "I will eat no flesh while the never, forever, or everlasting standeth." It is plain that this phrase was not used to express endless duration, by the sacred writers.

In Heb. 1: 2, and 11: 3, we have the phrase, *tous aionas*, and it is rendered "worlds." "By whom also he made the worlds. Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God." On the first of these texts, Pierce says, "If we render the words by whom also he appointed the ages, the sense will fall in with Eph. 3: 11. See Mr. Locke upon that verse." See on this passage in the last section. On the second,

Macknight says it is literally, "*sæcula*, the ages." Ewing renders it, "By faith we understand the ages were framed by the word of God." Those ages, he says, were reckoned three, "that before the law, that under the law, and that under the Messiah."

Eph. 3: 21. "Unto him be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end." The Greek here is, *eis pasas tas geneas tou aionos ton aionon.* Macknight says this phrase literally is, "throughout all the generations of the age of ages." Is a proper eternity measured by generations? Surely not. By the age of ages seems to be meant the duration of Messiah's reign, or until he delivers up the kingdom to God the Father, 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. Until then, God is to be glorified in the church by Christ Jesus. I would suggest it for consideration, Is not the age of the Messiah called the age of ages, in a similar sense as he is called "King of kings, and Lord of lords"? The age of the Messiah was that for which all the others were constituted, shall continue throughout all the generations of this world, and is to be superseded by no other, like the ages which have preceded it.

The word *aion* is not only rendered "world," but we read both of the beginning and end of the world or age; the one class precisely answering to the other. Let us first notice the texts which speak of the beginning of the age or world. Eph. 3: 9. "And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ." Wakefield renders it thus, "Was hidden from the ages in God." Macknight, in his note on this text, says, "Hid from the ages. So the original phrase, *apo ton aionon*, ought to be translated, as is plain from Col. 1: 26, where generations are also mentioned." To render *aion* here by any word implying endless duration, would make the apostle speak of the beginning of the everlasting or eternal duration which would be a contradiction in terms. Tit. 1: 2.

"In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began." Wakefield renders it "promised before the ages." Macknight, on this text, says, "Before the times of the ages. *Pro chronon aionion.* Supposing the word *aionios* in this clause to signify eternal, the literal translation of the passage would be, before eternal times. But that being a contradiction in terms, our translators, contrary to the propriety of the Greek language, have rendered it, 'before the world began.' As Locke observes, on Rom. 16: 25, the true literal translation is, 'before the secular times;' referring us to the Jewish jubilees, by which times were computed among the Hebrews; as among the Gentiles they were computed by generations of men. Hence, Col. 1: 26, 'The mystery which was kept hid (*apo ton aionon kai apo ton geneon*), from the ages and from the generations,' signifies the mystery which was kept hid from the Jews and from the Gentiles. See this explained, Rom. 16: 25, note 3." Whitby's note is, for substance, the same. Did God promise eternal life before the everlasting or the eternity began? The same or similar remarks apply to Rom. 16: 25. "According to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began." Wakefield renders it, "which was kept secret from the ages of old." See Macknight on Rom. 16: 25; Luke 1: 70. "As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began." Permit me to ask: Has God spoken by his holy prophets which have been since the everlasting or eternity began? Who believes eternity has a beginning? Accordingly, Wakefield renders it, "from the first." In his note, he says, "*ap aionos*" signifies "or of old, literally, from the age." Dr. Campbell renders it, "as anciently he promised by his holy prophets;" and Whitby, "from the beginning of ages." Acts 3: 21. "Which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." The Greek phrase is the same here as in the last text, and is rendered in the

same way, and the same remarks apply to it, and need not be repeated. See Macknight on Romans 16: 25. In Acts 15: 18, the Greek is the same as in the last text, which saves all labor of transcribing or remarks. John 9: 32. "Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind." Wakefield renders it, "never was it heard yet;" and Dr. Campbell has it, "never was it heard before." See on the preceding texts. 2 Tim. 1: 9. "Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus, before the world began." The Greek phrase here is, *pro chronon aionion*, which Wakefield renders, "before the age." Whitby, "before any age hath passed." Macknight, "before the times of the ages." See his note quoted on Tit. 1: 2, above. 1 Cor. 2: 7. "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory." The Greek here is, *pro ton aionon*. Macknight renders it, "before the ages." He understands it, "before the Mosaic dispensation." See his notes on Rom. 16: 25; Eph. 3: 9, and Col. 1: 26, above.

Such are all the places where the phrases, the beginning of the world — from the beginning of the world — before the world — and since the world began, occur. On the whole of them I would remark,

1st. That in none of them is there any reference, as many suppose, to this material world, or its beginning. The word *aion*, rendered world, signifies, by the consent of the above critics, and others which might be quoted, simply age. Since the world began, is since the age began. Before the world, signifies before the age, and from the beginning of the world, means from the beginning of the age. If it be asked, What age? the answer is, The age or dispensation of the law of Moses. If this be true, and it is indisputable, all must see what a great change it makes in the sense of all the above passages.

Besides, it deeply affects the sense of many others, and affords a key to the understanding of some, which we shall presently notice. So far from *aion* signifying this material world, the above critics have shown that our translators, contrary to the propriety of the Greek language, have rendered Tit. 2: 2, "before the world began," which remark applies equally to the other passages. They have shown that it refers to the dispensation of the law of Moses, which, as Locke observes, is called *aion*, the age, Luke 1: 70, Acts 3: 21; and *chronos aionioi*, because, under the law, time was measured by ages or jubilees.

2. The word for this "material world" is *kosmos*, and not *aion*. And the Greek phrase for "before the world," meaning this material world, is *pro tou ton kosmon*. See John 17: 5. Besides, where it is used it is never contrasted with *aion*. For example, the beginning of the *kosmos*, world, is never contrasted with the end of the *aion*, or age, nor the beginning of the *aion*, age, contrasted with the end of the *kosmos*, world.

3. Every person must perceive the absurdity of rendering *aion*, in any of the above texts, by any English word which conveys the idea of endless duration. Were it done, we should read of the beginning of the everlasting, or forever, and of things which were done before the everlasting or forever began; yea, of things which God ordained before the everlasting or forever. Let any one go over all those passages, and he cannot help being convinced that the sacred writers attached no such idea to this word. Are not men very much to blame, then, in being so very confident that *aion* expresses the endless duration of punishment? By the general consent of critics and commentators, yea, by the very scope of the above passages, *aion* signifies age. We ought not, then, very hastily to abandon this as its meaning in other places, unless it is certainly shown that this cannot be its sense, but means endless duration.

Let us now pay attention to another class of texts,

which speak of the "end of the world or age," and correspond to the above which speak of the "beginning of the world or age." This is nothing more than might be expected, unless the Jewish age or dispensation was to be of endless duration. Matt. 24: 3. "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" The Greek phrase here for "the end of the world," is *sunteleia tou aionos*. Dr. Campbell renders it, "the conclusion of this state;" and both Wakefield and Macknight, "the end of the age." Indeed, all the critics and commentators which I have ever seen, allow that this phrase means the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. The whole discourse in which it occurs shows that this is a correct view of the expression. In a case so obvious, it would be useless to spend time in a formal proof of it. I may just notice, to understand *aion* here to mean endless duration of time, would represent the disciples as asking our Lord to tell them what should be the sign of his coming, and of "the end of the everlasting or endless duration." But, if it means age, it ought to be understood so in other places, unless good reasons can be offered why it ought to be differently understood. The next passage where it occurs is,

Matt. 13: 36—42. "Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house; and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man: the field is the world: the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one: the enemy that sowed them is the devil: the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire;

there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Precisely the same Greek phrase, as in the last text, occurs twice in this passage, and is rendered, in the common version, in a similar manner. Wakefield and Dr. Campbell render it in the same way, "the conclusion of this age," and "the conclusion of this state." But it is referred, by some, to the end of this material world, when all the wicked shall be cast into a furnace of fire, or into hell. That the phrase, "the end of the world," has the same sense here as in the preceding passage, I shall now briefly show. The things which demand particular attention are,

1st. The field in which both these seeds are said to be sown. It is said expressly, "The field is the world." The word for world here is *kosmos*, and not *aion*, which is also rendered "world," verses 39, 40. Now, let it be particularly observed, that in these two verses where it is said, "the harvest is the end of the world," and "in the end of the world," when the tares were to be gathered, it is not the end of the *kosmos*, world, or field, in which the seeds were sown, but the end of the *aion*, or age, as in Matt. 24: 3. Our Lord declared that the end of this world or age was to take place during that generation. But, in order to make out the common opinion, our Lord should have said, verses 39, 40, "The harvest is the end of the *kosmos*, or field, in which the two seeds were sown; and that in the end of this *kosmos*, world, the tares should be gathered and burned." But not a word is said about the end of the field, but only the end of the *aion*, or age, which many of that generation lived to see.

2d. This furnace of fire is commonly believed to be in a future state of existence, and is another expression for hell fire. But all this is taken for granted. Where, then, was it? Let the Scriptures answer the question. In Isai. 31: 9, it is said, "The Lord, whose fire is in Zion, and whose furnace is in Jerusalem." It should be remembered, that our Lord spoke to the Jews, who had the Old Testament in their hands, and without doubt

knew that God had thus spoken by the prophet. But it may be asked, How was God's furnace in Jerusalem, and in what did it consist? Ezek. 22: 17—23, will inform us of this, "And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross; all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace; they are even the dross of silver. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Because ye are all become dross, behold, therefore, I will gather you in the midst of Jerusalem. As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it; so will I gather you in my anger, and in my fury, and I will leave you there, and melt you. Yea, I will gather you and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof. As silver is melted in the midst of the furnace, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof; and ye shall know that I the Lord have poured out my fury upon you." Who can read this passage without perceiving where this furnace was, in what it consisted, and also who were cast into it? The prophet and our Lord both spoke of the Jews. At the end of the age, as the prophet had declared, the whole Jewish nation had become "dross." With the exception of believers in Jesus, the nation of the Jews exactly corresponded to this description of them. This one fact is sufficient to show that the prophet and our Lord had respect to the same time, people, and punishment. Our Lord borrows his language, in regard to the furnace of fire, from the prophet. Further, it was at the end of the age, or Jewish dispensation, God brought such dreadful miseries on the Jewish nation, described under the figure of a furnace of fire. Ezekiel declared that God would gather the Jewish nation into Jerusalem as men "gather metals into the midst of a furnace." This was literally fulfilled. With the strictest propriety it might be said, that God gathered them, for it was in obedience to the command of God the whole nation were assembled at the

feast of the passover, when Titus surrounded the city, and from which they could not make their escape. They had indeed become *dross*, and into this furnace they were gathered to be melted, as metals are gathered to be melted in the midst of a furnace. Well, how did God melt them? This is figurative language, and is thus explained, verse 22, "And ye shall know that I, the Lord, have poured out my fury upon you." Upon that generation of the Jews came all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, Matt. 23: 35. Then was great "tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world unto this time, no, nor ever shall be," Matt. 24: 21. See, also, 1 Thess. 2: 16. If any one wishes to see how God melted them like metals in this furnace, or how the tares were cast into this furnace to be burnt, at the end of the age, let him consult Josephus' account of the destruction of Jerusalem. The above passage in Ezekiel, the 24th of Matthew, and the passage before us, all had their fulfilment in the unheard-of calamities which came on that people. There was indeed, at this period, weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth, as our Lord declared.

But the following words strongly confirm the above remarks. At verse 43, our Lord said, "Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." At the end of the age, when such miseries came on the unbelieving Jews, the righteous, or Christ's disciples, did shine forth in the kingdom of their Father. Observing the signs of the approaching calamities, Matt. 24, they left the city, and were preserved, as stated by Macknight on this chapter. Our Lord told them, Luke 21: 28, "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Previous to this, Christians suffered the most severe persecutions from the Jews, but then they had rest from their persecutors. At that period the kingdom of God came with power. Christ was glorified in them, and they were glorified in

him. See on 2 Thess. chap. 1, below. In the words, "then shall the righteous shine forth in the kingdom of their Father," there seems to be an allusion to Dan. 12: 2, which, it has been shown, refers to the same time and events.

Such is a brief statement of our views of this passage. In confirmation of them I would add the following. It has been shown that the temporal judgments of God on the Jewish nation are set forth under the figure of a furnace of fire. Now, we call on any man to produce a single passage, where punishment, in a future state of existence, is described under such a figure. It will not do to take it for granted, that it is done by our Lord in this passage, and in face of the evidence we have adduced to the contrary. No; let proof be brought forward that this is his meaning. Let it be accounted for, why the temporal calamities which came on the Jewish nation are spoken of under the figure of a furnace of fire, yet future eternal punishment is never so represented in the Scripture. Besides, let some reason be given why the same Greek phrase, rendered the end of the world, Matt. 24: 3, and allowed to mean the end of the age or Jewish dispensation, should not also mean the very same thing in the passage before us. Scripture usage, both as to this phrase and the furnace of fire, is against the common opinion, and in favor of the views I have advanced. It is very evident, also, from the New Testament, that, at the end of the Jewish age, a separation was to take place, and is represented under various figures, as well as in plain language. In the passage before us this separation between the righteous and the wicked is represented by separating tares and wheat. In others, separating chaff and wheat, good and bad fish, &c. The question is, Did a separation take place at the end of the Jewish age, answerable to these figurative representations? I answer, Yes. The whole Jewish nation were like chaff and wheat promiscuously on the same floor, whether believers in Christ, or unbelievers; or like

good and bad fish in the same net; or as tares and wheat growing in the same field. But at the end of the age a separation did take place, when the Jews were scattered among all nations, and the separation between them and Christians, or children of the kingdom, has continued to this day.

It is very evident, that *aion*, in this passage, could not well be rendered by any word signifying endless duration. If it were, it would make our Lord to say, "The harvest is the end of the everlasting or forever," and, "So shall it be in the end of this everlasting or forever." But who would impute such things to him, who spake as never man spake? To suppose he did, would make a plurality of forevers; for this forever implies another forever. Besides, it shows that forever is to end, and that the endless punishment of the wicked is only to begin at the end of the forever, if the furnace of fire means hell fire in another state of existence.

Any objections which have occurred to the views advanced, I shall state and answer.

1st. "How, upon your views, could it be said that the Devil sowed the tares among the wheat?" If this be any objection against my views, it lies equally against the common view taken of this passage. If my views of the Devil be correct, this objection has no force.

2d. "Upon your views of this passage, how are angels to reap the harvest at the end of the age?" In reply, let it be noticed, that the term angel simply signifies a messenger. Let any one consult Whitby or Macknight, and he will see that the angels here referred to were not angelic spirits, but human messengers. He will also see how the separation at the end of the age was effected by them. But see on Matt. 25, below.

3d. "Why were the temporal miseries which came on the Jews represented under the figure of a furnace

of fire?" Answer; for a very good reason. A furnace of fire was the severest punishment which an eastern despot could devise. See Daniel 3. The temporal judgments which came on the Jews at the end of the age were such as the like had never been before, nor shall the like ever be again. The most severe eastern punishment, a furnace of fire, is therefore chosen to describe them. See Mark 13: 19, 20.

Matt. 13: 47—50. The same Greek phrase as in the two preceding texts occurs here, and is rendered in the same way. As our Lord is only illustrating the same things, and uses the very same figure of a furnace of fire, we forbear transcribing it, or remarking on it. The remarks made on the last passage are sufficient.

Matt. 28: 20. "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Precisely the same Greek phrase occurs here as in the foregoing texts, and is rendered the same way in the common version. Wakefield renders it, "the conclusion of the age;" and Campbell, "the conclusion of this state." Parkhurst considers the Greek phrase here as referring to the end of the age of the Messiah, and as equivalent to the end of this world; yet precisely the same phrase, Matt. 24: 3, he says signifies the end of the Jewish age or dispensation. But I ask, Why depart from the obvious sense of this expression, Matt. 24: 3? Scripture usage ought not to be departed from without good reasons. What leads to such a departure here, probably, is, that to say "the end of the world" means the end of the age or Jewish dispensation, would limit Christ's promise to be with his disciples to this period. This would not certainly follow. But I shall proceed to show that, in the sense Christ here promised to be with his disciples, it was not needed beyond the end of the Jewish dispensation.

It seems to be overlooked that our Lord was here ad-

dressing himself to the eleven apostles. Nor is it sufficiently understood in what sense he promised to be with them unto the end of the age. If verse 16 and the parallel texts are consulted, it appears that the apostles are the persons of whom he speaks, and he promised to be with them in a sense he never was, and never will be again, with any other persons. He was with them, in teaching them the doctrine and laws of his kingdom, and enabling them to work miracles in proof of their being his ambassadors to the world. But will any man have the arrogance to affirm that Christ is with him in such a sense? The vain and arrogant pretences of men to being ambassadors of Christ, we hope are now nearly exploded. Supposing, then, that all the apostles had lived beyond the end of the age, or the destruction of Jerusalem; yea, let it be granted that they were all yet alive, there was no need for Christ being with them longer than to the end of the age. Am I asked why? I answer, before this period arrived the gospel must be preached to all the world. See Matt. 24: 14. When it arrived, the apostles had all finished their work for which they were called, and all of them, except John, had also finished their course. Allowing that they had all continued to live to the present day, would Christ have continued to be with them, still teaching them and enabling them to work miracles? I ask what need there was for this? All the will of God was revealed, and his word attested by miracles before the end of the age. Unless God had some further revelation to make by them, they could but repeat what before was preached and committed to writing and fully attested by miracles. Were they now alive, would they not, like us, believe and obey what God, previous to the end of the age, enabled them to communicate to the world? This I am persuaded few will question. It is easily seen then, that the phrase, "the end of the world," is in agreement with the usage of it in all the other texts, and that Christ's promise to be with his apostles at this period was as long

as his promise was needed, or indeed could be enjoyed by them in this mortal state.

I may just notice that I have no occasion to discuss the disputed question that miracles were continued in the church for the first three hundred years. Granting that they were continued, let it be noticed that none but the apostles were our Lord's commissioned and accredited ambassadors to the world. With them, and them only, we have to do as instructors. If he was with any others, working miracles, beyond the end of the Jewish age, it does not concern us, nor does it affect the question we are at present considering.

It is very plain that *aion*, here rendered world, was not used to express endless duration. To suppose this, would make our Lord promise to be with his apostles to the end of everlasting or eternity. This would give rise to many questions. What time does eternity end? If it ends, pray when did it begin? And were the apostles to live to the end of eternity? Besides, if eternity ends, how is endless punishment to be established?

Heb. 9: 26. "For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." The word *world* occurs twice in this verse, but in the first it is the rendering of the word *kosmos*, and in the second that of *aionon*. Most readers suppose the first has a reference to the beginning of this material world, and the second to the end of it. The first is true, but nothing could be further from the truth than the second. Was it in the end of this material world Christ appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself? It was not in the end of the *kosmos* or world mentioned in the first part of the verse, but in the end of the ages. Hence Macknight renders it thus: "But now once, at the conclusion of the ages, he hath been manifested to abolish sin-offering by the sacrifice of himself." All must see how absurd it would be to say

here, that at the end of the everlastings or eternities, Christ appeared to abolish sin-offering. It is agreeable to the fact, that at the end of the ages or Jewish dispensation he did appear and accomplish this.

1 Cor. 10: 11. "Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples; and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come." Though the Greek expression here is somewhat different from that used in the preceding passages, without a doubt the apostle referred to the same period. Macknight renders it "upon whom the ends of the ages are come." In his note he says, "This may mean the end of the Mosaic dispensation, whose duration was measured by ages or jubilees; see Rom. 16: 25, note 3; or, it may signify the last dispensation of religion. For there was the Patriarchal age, or dispensation, the Mosaic age, and the Gospel age." See Whitby's note on this text, who renders this phrase "the end of the ages."

I shall now proceed to consider two other classes of texts in which *aion* occurs, corresponding to each other in the New Testament,—those which speak of "this world or age," and "the world or age to come." Let us first bring forward all those which speak of this world. *Aion* and *kosmos*, both rendered world, are very different in signification, and we do not recollect an instance where these words are used as synonymous. In the texts now to be introduced, the word for world is not *kosmos*, but *aion*. The phrases for "this world" are *tou aionos touto*, *to aioni touto*, and *en to nun aioni*, and occur in the following places. 2 Cor. 4: 4. "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not." On this text Macknight says "some have it age." In Eph. 6: 12, "For we wrestle against the rulers of the darkness of this world." Wakefield here renders *aion* age. But again it is said, Gal. 1: 4, "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world." Here again Wakefield

has it age. On this text Macknight thus writes: "Evil age, *aionos poneros*. In Scripture, the age or world is often put for the men of the world, and for their evil principles and practices. Thus, Rom. 12: 2: "Be not conformed, *aioni touto*, to this age." And in Luke 16: 8, it is said, "For the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." In 2 Tim. 4: 10, it is said, "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world." It surely cannot be meant that he loved this present everlasting or forever; nor that the children of this forever were wiser than the children of light. In Rom. 12: 2, it is said, "And be not conformed to this world." In 1 Cor. 3: 18, "If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world." I may just notice that *aion* is here rendered age, both by Wakefield and Macknight. Again, 1 Tim. 6: 17, it is said, "Charge them that are rich in this world." And Tit. 2: 12, "Teaching that we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." In the two last texts the Greek is *en to nun aioni*, and ought to have been rendered in both the same way. It is obvious, *aion* could not have been rendered everlasting or forever in any of these texts, without making the inspired writers speak nonsense. Nor can we perceive why the above critics rendered *aion* age, in 1 Cor. 3: 18, and not so in all the other places. But to proceed: in Matt. 13: 22, it is said, "And the cares of this world choke the word." See the same, Mark 4: 19. And 1 Cor. 1: 20, it is said, "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" I may just notice here that the word for world in the last part of this verse and in verse 21, is not *aion*, but *kosmos*, in the original. A marked distinction is made between them in the Greek, though this is concealed, by both being rendered world in our version. In 1 Cor. 2: 6—8, it is said, "Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect; yet not the wisdom of this world, nor of the princes of this

world that come to naught; but we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world know: for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." The word *aion* here is rendered by Wakefield age, and Macknight's note on it shows us what is meant by the phrase rendered "this world" in all the above passages. He says, "Locke observes that in the writings of the New Testament, *aion outes*, this world, commonly signifies the state of mankind before the publication of the Gospel, as contradistinguished to the evangelical state or constitution, which is commonly called, *aion mellon*, the world to come." The following things are worthy of notice in this quotation. 1st. It is allowed that the phrase "this world" does not mean this material world, but signifies the state of mankind before the publication of the Gospel. And, 2d. That this state is contradistinguished from another called the evangelical state or constitution, and called *aion mellon*, the world to come. If this be correct, it essentially alters the sense of all the passages where these expressions occur. Am I asked, How it does this? I answer; that in the passages where the expression "this world" occurs, people understand it to mean this material world, and by the expression "world to come" is universally understood the future state. The above quotation applies to all the texts where the phrases "this world" and the "world to come" occur. Such are all the texts where the phrase "this world" occurs by itself. It is found in some others, and is joined with the phrase "world to come." Before introducing these I would notice the following things from the texts already brought forward.

1st. Supposing that *aion* in the above texts had been rendered everlasting, forever, or by any word conveying the idea of endless duration, what would have followed? We should then have read of this forever, this present forever, and of this present evil forever. This would naturally lead to the inquiry, how many forevers are

there? And how many of them are evil? We should also be exhorted not to be conformed to this forever, and to become fools in this forever, and to live soberly, righteously and godly in this forever, and the rich that they should not be high-minded in this forever. We should also be told that the cares of this forever choke the word; and the question would be asked, Where is the disputer of this forever? Besides, the apostle would be made to say that he spoke of the wisdom and princes of this forever, even the wisdom which God ordained before the forever, and which none of the princes of this forever knew. We should also read of the God of this forever, and the rulers of the darkness of this forever, and Christ gave himself that he might deliver us from this present evil forever.

2d. The word world, by which *aion* is rendered in the above texts, conceals all these glaring improprieties, but it is obvious enough that even world is not a very correct rendering. Who does not perceive this in the passages where it is said "this present world," and "this present evil world"? The questions here naturally enough occur, How many worlds are there, how many of them are evil, and is not this world always present? Why, then, speak of it not only as evil but as present? And, according to the sense commonly affixed to the word world, how could the apostle with truth say that none of the princes of this world had known Christ? Surely some princes of this world knew him, for Abraham was a mighty prince, and rejoiced to see his day afar off and was glad.

3d. It is easily seen that if *aion* is rendered age in all the above texts, not only are such improprieties avoided, but a beauty and force are added to some of them, which are concealed by our present translation. Convinced of this, some of the most eminent orthodox critics and commentators have rendered *aion* age, and the translators of our common version have done the same in several passages. Why it was not done in many more, deserves the

reader's consideration. We believe it is now a generally conceded point that age, in a great many instances at least, is a better rendering than the word world.

Let us now attend to the passages where the phrase "world to come" is used. The first is Heb. 6 : 5; "And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come." The Greek for "world to come" is *mellontos aionos*. Let us then hear what good orthodox writers say is the sense of this expression. Whitby, on this text, says, "The world to come doth, in the language of the prophets and Jewish doctors, signify the times of the Messiah, who, in the prophet Isaiah, is called 'the Father of the world to come.' See note on chap. 2 : 5. The powers, therefore, of the world to come, according to the Scripture idiom, must be the external operations of the Holy Ghost, viz., the gifts of faith, of healing, of casting out devils, 1 Cor. 12 : 8, 9, 'the working of miracles,' or the operations of powers." Peirce says, "The world or age to come is a Hebrew phrase, and signifies the times of the Messiah, *oulm eba*." Macknight gives us the same explanation as Whitby; and Dr. Owen, whose praise is in all orthodox churches, explains this phrase in the same manner. See, also, the new Theological Repository, vol. I., pp. 51—53, for the same explanation, given at considerable length, all of which my limits forbid quoting. We have introduced, on the phrase "world to come," all these testimonies for several reasons. These authors are as one man agreed about the meaning of this expression. They establish beyond all contradiction that the phrase "world to come" does not mean the future eternal state of existence after death, but the age of the Messiah.

Heb. 2 : 5. "For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come whereof we speak." The Greek phrase, here rendered the "world to come," is *oikoumene ton mellousan*, which evidently means the same as in the last text. Parkhurst, on the word *oikoumene*, says, "The world to come," Heb. 2 : 5, seems to

denote the state of the world under the Messiah, or the kingdom of the Messiah, which began at his first advent, and shall be completed at his second glorious coming. The Jews in like manner call the kingdom of the Messiah *eba oulem*, the world to come, probably from the prophecy of Isai. 65: 17, where it is represented by new heavens and a new earth. It is observable that Paul uses this phrase only in this passage of his Epistle to the Hebrews or converted Jews, as being, I suppose, a manner of expression peculiar to them, but not so intelligible to the Gentile converts." See Whitby and Doddridge on the place, and comp. Heb. 6: 5." See, also, Peirce on this text, and on Heb. 1: 14. All these, and other writers which might be named, give the same explanation of the phrase "world to come," which I forbear quoting. But in the following texts the phrase, "this world," and "the world to come," are mentioned together.

Eph. 1: 21. "Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that to come." The Greek here is *ou mo non en to aioni to uto alla kai en to mellonti*, which Wakefield renders, "not only in this, but also in the future age."

Matt. 12: 31, 32. "Wherefore, I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." See the parallel texts, Mark 3: 29—30, and Luke 12: 10. The common doctrine from these passages is that neither before nor after death can the sin against the Holy Ghost be forgiven. As this doctrine has driven some to madness, and others to suicide, common humanity would say, "examine if it be true." Those who contend for it, overlook that it is implied that some sins may be forgiven in the world to come, if their

view of this phrase be correct. But do they allow that any sins are to be forgiven after death? Taking into view all the above passages, let us consider,

1st. Wherein the great guilt of the sin against the Holy Spirit consisted From Mark 3: 28—30, and other places, it appears that the guilt of this sin consisted in seeing miracles wrought and imputing them to the power of an unclean spirit. It was resisting the highest degree of evidence which could be given of the mission of our Lord. Therefore, let us consider,

2d. When or where it could not be forgiven. It is said it shall not be forgiven in "this world." This means, as we have seen from orthodox writers, it should not be forgiven in the Jewish age, which was then nearly ended. Nor could it be forgiven in the world or age to come, which we have seen, from the same authors, means the age of the Messiah, which was to succeed the Jewish age or dispensation. Whitby renders the words, "neither in this age, nor the age to come." It seems, then, a very obvious case that when it is said the sin against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come, there is no reference to a state after death. It simply means it should not be forgiven while the Jewish age or dispensation continued, nor under the age of the Messiah, which was then about to commence; or, in other words, during the ministry of our Lord or his apostles, who both wrought miracles, which were necessary to be seen wrought, and blasphemed against, in order to any person's committing this sin.

Well, its being said, "It shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come," is strong, explicit language, importing the non-forgiveness of this sin. It is, nor do we wish to lessen its force, but shall attempt to meet it fairly and fully. But let us first hear Macknight. He says, "Or we may translate the clause differently, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age, neither in the age to come, importing that no expiation was provided for the blasphemer of the Spirit,

either under the Jewish or Christian dispensation." What, then, was the unpardonable nature of the sin of blasphemy, during the period called "this world," which we have seen means the Jewish age or dispensation? It is well known, that to the blasphemer under the law, no pardon was granted; no sacrifice could expiate his crime; he must suffer death. Permit me now to ask, Was the punishment of such persons unpardonable in any other sense than that they suffered temporal death? Even the blasphemer of the God of Israel, his blasphemy is not mentioned as unpardonable, so as to affect his future endless happiness. No one, surely, will contend, that to blaspheme against the Holy Spirit was a greater crime; for, allowing the Spirit to be the third person in the Godhead, he is not greater than the God of Israel. How, then, do we understand this blasphemy to be a sin, which, when committed, the person's case is past all remedy? But other sins besides blasphemy were unpardonable under the Mosaic dispensation. The sin of Moses and Aaron at Maribah was so, and was punished with death in the wilderness. The sin of Eli's house could not be purged with sacrifice nor burnt offering forever. Murder was also unpardonable. They were to take the murderer from God's altar and put him to death. As "the world to come," then, refers to the age of the Messiah, this sin is to be unpardonable, and unpardonable in the same sense as it was during the Jewish age called "this world." Its unpardonable nature, we think, must be understood in the same sense, for no distinction is made by our Lord in the two cases. If the sense in which it was unpardonable during the Jewish age, was, that the person must suffer temporal death for it, the same must be its sense under the age of the Messiah. It is generally admitted that temporal death was the punishment of crimes under the old dispensation; and that temporal death was inflicted for crimes under the new, no one will dispute; for Ananias and his wife, persons in the church at Corinth, are noted examples;

and John speaks of a sin unto death, for which even Christians were not to pray, 1 John 5: 16, 17.

Stating then this sin at its utmost extent, persons were to suffer death for it, as was inflicted on the blasphemer of the God of Israel. What, some may say, do men suffer death for this sin in our day? I answer, no, and for a very good reason, because it is impossible, in the nature of the case, to commit it in the present day. Is it asked why? I answer, because miracles must be seen performed by the person, and he must resist their evidence, and ascribe their performance to an unclean spirit, before he can commit this sin. It could only be committed by persons under the ministry of our Lord and his disciples, who wrought miracles. Did men now see these miracles, as the persons did whom our Lord addressed, it could be committed; but, unless the age of miracles return, it is impossible. The miracles wrought before the Jews, was the highest degree of evidence which could be given them that he was the true Messiah. Resisting and blaspheming them, rendered their case hopeless, for no further evidence could be given to convince them. But it may be said, Did the unbelieving Jews suffer temporal death for this crime? They could not be put to death for it by the Mosaic law, for they did not believe they had in this case blasphemed. Besides, the execution of this law was in their own hands. But death was inflicted on that evil generation of Jews, for upon them came all the righteous blood shed upon the earth. Not believing in Jesus, they died in, or rather by their sins, for the wrath of God came on them to the uttermost.

If the views which have been stated of the sin of blasphemy, and its punishment, be correct, it fully accounts for one remarkable fact, which is not easily accounted for on the common views entertained of it. How is it accounted for, that neither our Lord nor his apostles ever made any exception of such persons, in preaching forgiveness of sins, either to Jews or Gentiles? Our Lord commanded his apostles to begin at Jerusalem,

but gives no directions to them to except a single individual whom they might address. John prohibits Christians from praying for one of their brethren, who had sinned a sin unto death, but not a hint is dropped prohibiting forgiveness of sins to be preached to any who had blasphemed against the Holy Spirit. On my views of this sin, this is all as it ought to be, and as might be expected. But can it ever be reconciled with the common opinion, that those who sinned this sin placed themselves without the boundaries of God's mercy? Either they believed that none had committed it, or they believed that it did not except the persons, any more than others, from having repentance and forgiveness of sins preached unto them. Had they believed such persons were exceptions from the mercy of God, would they not have said, "The sin against the Holy Spirit is utterly unpardonable. All you who have committed it, your situation is past remedy. We can neither pray for you, nor preach to you forgiveness." But we search in vain for anything like this in all the inspired writings. The only thing like it is John's prohibition to Christians to pray for a brother who had sinned a sin unto death. But no one understands this as affecting the eternal condition of the individual, but the punishment of temporal death.

But it may be said, "Plausible as all this appears, it ought to be recollected, that it is not only said such persons have 'never forgiveness,' but it is also added, that they are in danger of eternal damnation." I have not forgotten this, and shall now give it all due attention. The Greek phrase for "eternal damnation" is *aionion kriseos*. I do not stop to remark, but simply notice, that the persons are only said to be in danger of this; whereas people in our day speak with positive certainty, both as to this and Judas being in hell. The word here rendered damnation simply means punishment. It is so rendered in other passages. See Dr. Campbell's note on Mark 12: 40, where he shows this. The words damned and damnation lead people's minds into a future state

for this punishment. This is a very false idea, and ought to be corrected; for the word damnation is used in the common version where they will allow it has nothing to do with a future state. See Rom. 13: 2, and other places. We are aware it will be said, the word eternal, joined here with damnation, shows that the punishment is in a future state, and of endless duration. It is then allowed that the whole depends upon the word eternal. Indeed, I presume it is this word joined with damnation which leads most people to conclude that it is of endless duration. Would they ever have believed this doctrine had this not been the case? Let it be noticed,

1st. That our Lord, in the above passages, was addressing Jews. They were the persons who committed this unpardonable sin, if ever it was committed. They had the occasion presented to them for its commission, as they chiefly enjoyed the ministry and miracles both of Christ and his apostles. Not a hint is dropped that any of the Gentiles ever committed this sin.

2d. Being Jews, they were familiar with the use of *olim* in the Old, and *aion* in the New Testament. And it has been seen, that *olim*, in their Scriptures, is applied very often to things which were to end, and which have already ended. The person who would, therefore, understand this text and others in the New Testament, must consider how this language was understood among the Jews, and not how Christians now understand it.

3d. The Jews could not help seeing, that in their Scriptures, *olim*, rendered everlasting, was applied to a temporal punishment threatened them as a nation. This we have shown, and this we shall show hereafter on Matt. chap. 25, and 2 Thess. 1: 5—10. Now, permit me to ask, Did any Jew, or did any one else, ever conclude that the word *olim* described a never-ending punishment, either in this or a future world? As this will not be affirmed, permit me to ask, By what fair rule of interpretation do we then interpret eternal damnation or punishment in this passage to mean endless punishment

in a future state? As our Lord was speaking to Jews, is it not more scriptural and natural to understand him as using this expression in agreement with the language of their sacred books, than in the sense Christians interpret it? In what other sense could our Lord use it, or in what other sense could Jews understand such language, but in the way it had been used by the preceding Scripture writers? But this will appear conclusive by considering,

4th. That in no part of the Old Testament is *olim* ever used and applied to a punishment after death. The reader has had all the texts where the word is used in the Old Testament laid before him, and those in which it could be supposed to have such a sense have been particularly considered. Let him, then, judge if our Lord used, and the Jews could understand, the expression, eternal damnation, in the sense we moderns put upon it. The proof, at any rate, lies with those who believe so, for no man can prove a negative. But we have in this case some proof that our Lord neither meant, nor was he so understood by the Jews who heard him. First, no Jew believed that he was to suffer endless punishment, either here or hereafter. See Whitby on Romans 2. Again, no doctrine our Lord advanced could have been more displeasing to the Jews. They to suffer endless punishment who were the children of Abraham? No; this was far from their thoughts. But, again, though our Lord and the Jews had many reasonings and contentions arising from his doctrines, do we ever find that any of them arose from his threatening them with endless punishment in a future state? No, nothing like this appears. Either, then, our Lord did not threaten them with this, or, if he did, they did not understand him; or, if they did understand him, they acted very differently about it from what they did on all other occasions. In this case, they submitted very tamely to a threatening never before mentioned in their Scriptures, and directly in face of all their prejudices as a nation.

5th. We see nothing in the expression "eternal damnation," indicating endless punishment, any more than in others which we think we have shown refer to no such thing. Is this expression stronger in favor of the doctrine than "damnation of hell," "the fire that shall never be quenched," with others, which we think have been proved in the Inquiry into the Words Sheol, &c., to refer to temporal punishment? Or, is it stronger in favor of this doctrine than the expressions "everlasting fire," "eternal punishment," "everlasting destruction," with others, which we shall presently show have no such meaning? If these expressions refer to the temporal punishment of the Jews, why not also the expression "eternal damnation," before us? Jews who blasphemed against the Holy Spirit were addressed. The most convincing proofs had been offered them that Jesus was the Messiah. These they resisted, and blasphemed the power by which they were performed. They were soon to fill up the measure of their iniquity, and could not escape the damnation of hell. There remained for them no more sacrifice for their sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation to devour them as adversaries. Their sin was not to be forgiven that their punishment might be averted. They were in danger of "eternal damnation," or punishment, even the everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, which as a nation they have suffered, and are still suffering. The Greek phrase, "*aioniou kriseos*," rendered "eternal damnation," may be rendered "of the age of judgment," or "of the judgment of the age," both words being in the genitive. It is called the damnation of hell, the fire that shall never be quenched, the greater damnation, and is set forth by the severest eastern punishment, "a furnace of fire." In plain language, it is described by our Lord, Matthew, chapters 24, 25.

Matt. 19: 27—29. "Then answered Peter, and said unto him, Behold, we have forsaken all and followed thee: what shall we have therefore? And Jesus said unto

them, Verily I say unto you, that ye that have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall inherit everlasting life." The parallel texts are, Mark 10: 28—31, and Luke 18: 28—30. Mark and Luke say, "And in the world to come life everlasting." Wakefield's rendering is, "And in the age that is coming everlasting life." It will not be questioned that the phrases, "this time," and "this present time," in these texts, express the same as is meant by the phrase "this world," or age, in preceding passages. They all refer to the Jewish age, which was to be superseded by the age of the Messiah, and repeatedly called the age or "world to come." In fact, no other age could come, for no other was promised or expected by the Jews, but the age of the Messiah. But the phrase, "world to come," by most Christians is interpreted to mean the state after death, and the phrase "everlasting life," the happiness to be enjoyed in that state. But that by "the world to come," is meant the age of the Messiah, is conclusively shown by orthodox writers above, who declare it is to end at Christ's second coming. See 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. My reasons for thinking that the eternal life here spoken of refers to the life enjoyed in the kingdom of Christ during the age of the Messiah, I shall as briefly as possible state:

1st. This appears from the Old Testament usage of the phrase "everlasting life," which occurs only in Dan. 12: 2, considered above. It is set in contrast with the shame and everlasting contempt which came on the Jewish nation at the end of the age. If their shame and everlasting contempt were to be endured in this state of existence, why not the eternal life, with which it is contrasted, be enjoyed also in the same state? The contrast would be incongruous if it is understood otherwise.

2d. From the context of the passages under consideration, it is evident that what our Lord said was in answer to Peter's question, verse 27, which was suggested by the discourse immediately preceding it, verses 16—27. According to Daniel's use of the words eternal life, what else could this man mean, than What good thing shall I do that I may enjoy the blessings of Messiah's reign, or enter into his kingdom? That this view of everlasting life is agreeable to the passage before us, is evident, for it was to be enjoyed in "the world to come," or in the age of the Messiah. The Jews were familiar with Daniel's writings, and if in this sense it was used there, how could the Jews in our Lord's day understand it in a different sense without some explanation? That this was the sense in which it was used, appears to me evident from the following statements, and the texts referred to. In the New Testament, "kingdom of heaven," and "kingdom of God," are phrases used to express the same thing: compare Matt. 19: 20, with verse 24, as an example. This is very obvious from comparing the four Gospels. It is also evident that to "have eternal life," and to "enter into eternal life," also mean the same thing. Compare Matt. 19: 16, with verse 17. But let it be particularly observed that to "enter into life," and "to have eternal life," is the same as "to enter into the kingdom of heaven," or "kingdom of God." This appears from comparing Matt. 19: 16, 17, with verses 23, 24. Also from comparing Mark 9: 43, 45, with verse 47, where entering into the kingdom of heaven, and entering into life, are used as equivalent expressions. If these statements are not correct, we should think it a hopeless case to ascertain the sense of Scripture by comparing one part of it with another. I may add that "to be saved," verse 25 of Matt. 19, seems to be used as an equivalent expression for "having eternal life," verse 16; "to enter into life," verse 17; and "to enter into the kingdom of heaven and kingdom of God," verses 23, 24. Let us now look at the context of the

passage before us. "And behold, one came and said to him, Good master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" verse 16. And compare Mark 10: 17; Luke 18: 18; Luke 10: 25. Permit me now to ask, When this person asked what good thing he should do to "have eternal life," did he mean to ask what he should do to obtain heaven and its happiness? We must doubt this, for we have seen that what he calls eternal life, verse 16, is to enter into life, verse 17, and to enter into the kingdom of heaven or kingdom of God, verses 23, 24. His meaning seems evidently to be, Good master, what shall I do to enter into the kingdom of heaven, or reign of the Messiah, whose kingdom or reign is about commencing. If this be correct, it is easily perceived how exactly this sense of the phrase agrees with the only place in the Old Testament where everlasting life is mentioned. Daniel told us that some should awake "to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." This person seemed to be awaking to everlasting life, but we see that his trusting in his riches still kept him from entering into the kingdom of God. One seems to have been so much awakened that our Lord said he was not far from the kingdom of God, or obtaining eternal life. See Mark 12: 28—35.

3d. It appears from considering where or when this eternal life was to be enjoyed. Not a word is said in the passage that this was in a future state of existence. It was to be when the Son of man sat on the throne of his glory, and the apostles on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. But are the apostles to sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel, in a future state of existence? Well, when was this? The following writers shall inform us. Macknight, on this passage, observes: "According to the common interpretation of these words, they relate entirely to the other life; implying that at the general judgment the apostles shall assist Christ in passing sentence upon the Israelites."

But so far from agreeing to this interpretation, he says, "In the seventh chapter of Daniel, the prophet, speaking of the erection of the Messiah's kingdom, says, verse 9, 'I beheld till the thrones were set (not cast down, as it is in our translation), and the Ancient of days did sit,' namely, on one of the thrones that were set. 13, 'And behold, one like the Son of man came to the Ancient of days,' while he sat on his throne, 'and they brought him near before him, and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom.' By the kingdom that was given to the Son of man, the prophet meant his mediatorial kingdom; and by the glory, his being seated beside the Ancient of days on one of the thrones mentioned verse 9, in testimony of his exaltation to that kingdom. The throne of his glory, therefore, which our Lord speaks of in the text, is the throne of his mediatorial kingdom, called the throne of his glory, in allusion to the representation which Daniel had given of it. In this kingdom, the apostles likewise were to be seated on thrones, and to judge the tribes; that is, were to be next the Messiah in dignity and office; his ministers, by whom he was to subdue and govern the church." See the whole of his note, a small part of which only I have quoted. See also Parkhurst on the word *krino*, who gives the same view of the passage. Dr. Campbell renders the 28th verse thus: "That at the renovation, when the Son of man shall be seated in his glorious throne, ye, my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge." In his note, part of which only I shall quote, he says, "We are accustomed to apply the term regeneration solely to the conversion of individuals; whereas its relation here is to the general state of things. As they were wont to denominate the creation genesis, a remarkable restoration, or renovation, of the face of things, was very suitably termed *paliggenesia*. The return of the Israelites to their own land, after the Babylonish captivity, is so named by Josephus, the Jewish historian. What was said on verse 23 holds equally in regard to the promise we have

here. The principal completion will be at the general resurrection, when there will be, in the most important sense, a renovation, or regeneration of heaven and earth, when all things shall become new; yet, in a subordinate sense, it may be said to have been accomplished when God came to visit in judgment that guilty land; when the old dispensation was utterly abolished, and succeeded by the Christian dispensation, into which the Gentiles, from every quarter, as well as Jews, were called and admitted." See also Whitby's note on Matt. 19: 27, 28, to the same effect.

It is obvious, from these statements, that the passage has no reference to a future state of existence, but to the establishment of Jesus in the throne of his kingdom, when the Old Testament was utterly abolished, and from which period he has been judging the world in righteousness, and the people with his truth. He, as king, reigns in righteousness, and the apostles with him decree justice, and shall continue to do so until the period called the end, 1 Cor. 15: 24—28, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God the Father. Can the statements of these writers prove false? Besides, the apostles and others are not to enjoy eternal life until the day of judgment, if this be the time Christ refers to by sitting on the throne of his glory. Is it objected, "Were not the disciples in the kingdom of Christ, and enjoying eternal life, in the sense in which you have explained it, at the time our Lord spoke?" Yes, but it was not until the Son of man came, at the end of the Jewish age, that his kingdom came with power. See Luke 21: 31—34; Mark 8: 38, and 9: 1. At this time it was profitable for his disciples to enter into life with the loss of all things dear to them, rather than to go into Gehenna or hell, or to suffer all the miseries which came on the Jewish nation. See Mark 9: 43—50, and the Inquiry into the Words Sheol, Hades, etc.

4th. This view of eternal life, enjoyed in the world to come, is confirmed from the following context. Our

Lord having said, "And shall inherit everlasting life," immediately adds, "But many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." Here the chapter ends; but it is evident the Saviour, in the beginning of the next chapter, goes on to illustrate his meaning by the parable commonly called the parable of the laborers in the vineyard. Well, let us ask the question, Many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first, about what? The answer from the context evidently is, about inheriting everlasting life, or entering into the kingdom of God. Accordingly, our Lord says, "For the kingdom of heaven (or inheriting everlasting life in it) is like unto a man who is an householder, who went out very early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard." This parable is interpreted by Macknight and others of the calling of the Jews and Gentiles; for the Gentiles, who were the last in having the kingdom of God preached to them, were the first to enter into the kingdom of God, or enjoy eternal life in this kingdom; and the Jews, to whom it was first preached, shall be last in entering into the enjoyment of the same blessing. This must be understood of both Jews and Gentiles, generally, as a people.

5th. The view given of eternal life will be confirmed, by attending to the general usage of this phrase in the New Testament. This must be done in a very brief way, for the texts are numerous where it occurs. The reader may consult the texts for himself; we shall give all the places where it is found, and shall propose some questions for his consideration. I find, then, *zoe* rendered "life," and used to express what we call natural life, 1 Cor. 3: 22; James 4: 14; Acts 8: 33; Rom. 8: 38; John 12: 25; Acts 17: 25; 1 John 5: 16; Luke 1: 75; Philip. 1: 20; Acts 2: 28; 1 Tim. 4: 8; 1 Cor. 15: 19; Rom. 7: 10; Heb. 7: 3; Acts 7: 19; Luke 17: 33; Luke 16: 25; Rev. 11: 11. It is also used to express the happiness or the good a man enjoys in this life, Luke 12: 15; 1 Peter 3: 10; Luke 16: 25; 2 Peter 1: 3.

But I find *zoe*, life, used to designate that moral or spiritual life enjoyed by believers in Jesus. Before believing they are spoken of as alienated from the life of God, Eph. 4: 18. In believing, they pass from death to life, 1 John 3: 14, 15. They have repentance unto life granted to them, Acts 11: 18, and obtain justification of life, Rom. 5: 18. By the power of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus they are made free from the power of sin and death, Rom. 8: 2. Their spirits or minds are alive, because of righteousness, Rom. 8: 10, and enjoy life and peace, verse 6. They have the light of life, John 8: 12; walk in newness of life, Rom. 6: 4, and hold forth the word of life, Philip. 2: 16. The meat Christ gave them endured to eternal life, John 6: 27, and the water, a well springing up to everlasting life, John 4: 14. They are exhorted to lay hold on eternal life, 1 Tim. 6: 12, 19, and seek for glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, Rom. 2: 7. And by sowing to the spirit they reaped life everlasting, Gal. 6: 8. They are exhorted to look for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life, Jude 21; have their fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life, Rom. 6: 22. The life of Jesus was made manifest in them, 2 Cor. 4: 10—12. They were heirs of the grace of life, 1 Peter 3: 7; were saved by Christ's life, Rom. 5: 10, and are said to reign in life, Rom. 5: 17. The names of such persons are said to be in the book of life, Philip. 4: 3; Rev. 3: 5; 13: 8; 17: 8; 20: 12, 15; 21: 27, and 22: 19. They drink of the water of life, John 4: 14; Rev. 21: 6, and 22: 1, 17; and by overcoming they were to eat of the tree of life, Rev. 2: 7; 22: 2, 14; and obtain a crown of life, James 1: 12; Rev. 2: 10. And mortality is at last to be swallowed up of life, 2 Cor. 5: 4. The gate which led to this life was strait and the way narrow, Matt. 7: 14. Several persons asked our Lord what they should do to obtain or inherit eternal life, Matt. 19: 16; Mark 10: 17;

Luke 10: 25, and 18: 18. And it is evident, from the context of all these passages, that to have eternal life, to enter into this life, and to enter into the kingdom of God, all referred to the same thing. See, also, Matt. 18: 8, 9, and 19: 17, 29; Mark 9: 43, 45.

It appears that man never would have known any other life, except natural life, but for the grace of God through Jesus Christ. Christ hath brought life and immortality to light, 2 Tim. 1: 10. With a view to this, God promised eternal life, 1 John 2: 25. It was promised before the Jewish age began, Tit. 1: 2. This promise of life was in or by Christ Jesus, 2 Tim. 1: 1. This promise laid a foundation for the hope of it, Tit. 1: 2, and 3: 7. The Father gave the Son to have life in himself, John 5: 26. Hence it is said, In him was life, John 1: 4. And he was made after the power of an endless life, Heb. 7: 16. Accordingly he is called the life, 1 John 1: 2, John 14: 6; the resurrection and the life, John 11: 25; the eternal life, 1 John 5: 20; and the eternal life who was with the Father and manifested to us, 1 John 1: 2. He is also termed the prince of life, Acts 3: 15, and the bread of life, John 6: 35, 48, 51, 53. The grace of God reigns through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ, Rom. 5: 21; and eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, Rom. 6: 23. This eternal life is in or by God's Son, 1 John 5: 11. He gives eternal life, John 10: 28, and gives it to as many as the Father hath given him, John 17: 2. This eternal life is expressly said to consist in knowing God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, John 17: 3. Hence the words of Christ were spirit and life, John 6: 63. He had the words of eternal life, verse 68. God's commandment was life everlasting, John 12: 50. Compare 1 John 1: 1. As eternal life consists in the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, so persons are said to enjoy it by believing, John 3: 15, 16; 1 Tim. 1: 16. They had it upon their believing, and it abode

in them by continuing to believe, John 3: 36; 5: 24; 6: 40, 47, 53, 54, and 20: 31; 1 John 5: 12, 13. The Jews thought that in their Scriptures they had eternal life, yet would not come to Christ, or believe on him, that they might have it, John 5: 39, 40. On the contrary, they judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life by rejecting the gospel, Acts 13: 46. Accordingly, the apostles turned to the Gentiles, and as many of them as were ordained or disposed for eternal life, believed, verse 48. The Jews had all the words of this life preached unto them, Acts 5: 20. The apostles in preaching were to some a savor of life unto life, and to others of death unto death, 2 Cor. 2: 16. In reaping the gospel harvest among the Jews, they gathered fruit unto life eternal, John 4: 36. And whosoever lost his life for Christ's sake kept it unto life eternal, John 12: 25, for at the end of the age those who endured to the end were saved. Those who believed not went away into everlasting punishment and the righteous into life eternal, Matt. 25: 46. Compare John 5: 29. And the receiving of the Jews again shall be as life from the dead, Rom 11: 15.

Such is a very brief review of all the texts where life, and everlasting life are spoken of in the New Testament. On the whole of them I would now propose a few queries and remarks. If eternal life refers to the happiness of heaven in a future state, how is it accounted for that eternal death is never spoken of as its counterpart to the wicked in a future state? Everlasting punishment is mentioned, Matt. 25: 46, as the counterpart of everlasting life, but everlasting or eternal death is not once named in the Bible. But it is well known that eternal death is a favorite expression with many preachers. But it may be said, everlasting punishment, everlasting life, everlasting destruction, are mentioned in the Bible, and are not these equivalent to eternal death? We answer, no; and it will be seen in the next section that such

expressions have no respect to punishment beyond this life. But, again, if eternal life refers to the happiness of heaven in a future state, how happens it that it is so often spoken of as enjoyed in this life, and dwelling in those who believe in Jesus? It is defined to consist in knowing God and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. It could not only be enjoyed here, but people could enter into this life, which is the same as entering into the kingdom of God. Further, though eternal life is sometimes spoken of as future, and an object of hope, yet I do not find it spoken of as an object expected after the resurrection of the dead, or once mentioned as equivalent to the happiness to be enjoyed in the resurrection state. It is rather spoken of as something expected after the end of the Jewish age, during the age of the Messiah, or the "world to come." The promise of eternal life, in this age to come, was made to Christ's disciples; for when our Lord spoke, the old dispensation had not then vanished away, and it was not until it ended that our Lord's kingdom came in its glory and power. It was a matter of hope to his disciples, for then they were to enter into life, or into the joy of their Lord. But, again, the term life is used both in the Old and New Testaments to express happiness or enjoyment. We have seen that it is used very often to designate the spiritual or moral life of believers. Those who believed were not condemned, did not perish, but were saved. Those who did not believe, of the Jewish nation, and those believers who did not endure to the end, did perish. The wrath of God abode on them, and his wrath came on them to the uttermost at the destruction of Jerusalem. The Jews, by putting the word of God from them, judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life. The apostles turned to the Gentiles, and thus the kingdom of God was taken from the Jews and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. I would only add that this eternal life is expressly said to be enjoyed in the world to come. This world or age to come, we are told by orthodox

authors above, began at our Lord's first advent, and shall be completed at his second coming. How, then, is eternal life to be enjoyed if the world to come ends, according to their own explanation of this expression?

In regard to the word everlasting being associated with the term life, it can occasion no serious difficulty. The term everlasting is also applied to the kingdom of Christ, and the gospel of this kingdom is called "the everlasting gospel." But, surely, no one ever thought that the gospel is to be preached to the endless ages of eternity. Is it said, How could the apostles enjoy everlasting life in the kingdom of God here, seeing a few years terminates the existence of every man in the world? I answer this by asking, How could Samuel abide before the Lord forever? or how could the slave serve his master forever? In short, how could the priesthood be enjoyed by Aaron and his sons forever? or the land of Canaan be an inheritance to Israel forever? But these remarks I have merely suggested for consideration. Allowing they have no weight, the grand subject of our investigation stands unaffected; for all must admit the remarkable fact, that frequent as eternal life is mentioned, yet no sacred writer ever ventured to speak of eternal death; and it is with the application of this word to future punishment we are at present chiefly concerned.

In Luke 20: 34—36, we have this world, and that world mentioned, or this age and that age or state. But, as it requires no particular consideration, it is unnecessary to transcribe it. I would only remark, that *aionos* here cannot mean endless duration or forever. It would not do to say the children of this forever marry, and the children of that forever do not marry.

SECTION VII.

ALL THE PLACES WHERE AION AND AIONIOS ARE USED TO EXPRESS THE DURATION OF PUNISHMENT, PARTICULARLY CONSIDERED, IN WHATEVER WAY RENDERED IN THE COMMON VERSION.

Matt. 25: 46, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal." See, also, verse 41, which refers to the same persons, and the same punishment. Before we proceed to consider these words, we beg leave to make some general remarks on chapters 24 and 25, together.

1st. What is contained in these two chapters is one continued discourse of our Lord's, addressed to his disciples. The word "then," in verse 1 of chapter 25, shows this. "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins." When was the kingdom of heaven to be likened to this? The answer is found in chapter 24, which is at the coming of Christ to destroy Jerusalem. It is further manifest from chapter 26: 1, "And it came to pass when Jesus had finished all these sayings." And what sayings could these be but all the sayings contained in the two chapters? For it will be difficult to point out any change of subject from verse 4, of chapter 24, to the end of chapter 25. That this discourse was delivered to the disciples alone, is plain from comparing chapter 24: 1—4, with chapter 26: 1, 2.

2d. The whole of this discourse is in answer to the questions put by the disciples, verse 3, of chapter 24, "Tell us when shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world," or age? This supposes he had said something about his coming, which we find was the case from the last verse of chapter 23. The questions put were to obtain information about his coming, and the signs whereby they might know its approach. All allow the coming, in

chapter 24, refers to our Lord's coming at the end of the Jewish dispensation; but many contend that the coming, in chapter 25, refers to his coming at the end of this world. But the word "then" so clearly marks the connection of these two chapters as to forbid such a supposition. Nor can any man point out where our Lord left off speaking of the one coming, and began to speak of the other. He mentions his coming, chapter 24: 3, 27, 30, 37, 39, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, and in chapter 25: 6, 10, 13, 19, 27, 31, as one; nor can any one doubt that the same coming, chapter 25: 31, is the same as that, chapter 24: 30—35, from the language used and the circumstances mentioned. See, also, Matt. 16: 27, 28; Luke 9: 26, 27; Mark 8: 38, and 9: 1. From verse 4 of chapter 24, our Lord proceeds to answer the disciples' questions, and points out particularly the signs whereby they might know that his coming was at hand. These I need not particularize.

3d. What has led many to conclude that chapter 25 refers to a day of general judgment, is overlooking the connection between the two chapters marked by the word "then," in verse 1 of chapter 25, and not noticing how exactly the three parts of chapter 25 correspond to and illustrate three things inculcated on the disciples, from verse 42 to the end of chapter 24. These I shall briefly notice, hoping the reader will compare the passages I refer to. Notice, then,

1st. That our Lord inculcates on his disciples the duty of watchfulness, in view of his coming. See chap. 24: 42—44. Let the reader, then, compare these three verses with chapter 25: 1—13, and we think he must be convinced that the parable of the ten virgins was spoken to illustrate and enforce on his disciples this very duty. Hence the parable ends with these words, expressive of its object, "Watch, therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh;" which are almost the very words in which he stated the duty of watchfulness in chapter 24: 43, 44. Who can

dispute this? But admit it, and Matt. 25 must be given up as referring to a day of general judgment at the end of this world.

2d. In chapter 24: 45, our Lord also inculcates on his disciples the duty of faithfulness, in view of his coming. Let the reader compare the second division of chapter 25, from verse 14—31, and we think he must also be convinced that the parable of the talents was spoken by our Lord to illustrate and enforce the duty of faithfulness upon them. Here I ask every candid reader to say, Is it not the same Son of man which is mentioned in both chapters? Are not the servants to whom the goods were delivered the same as in chapter 24: 45? Is not the faithfulness and unfaithfulness of the servants the same in both? And is not the coming of our Lord to reckon with them the same coming in both? Who can, with any show of reason, deny these things? But who can admit them, and yet contend that this second part of chapter 25 has any relation to a day of general judgment?

3d. In verse 46, and to the end of chapter 24, our Lord states the consequences which would result, according as they were found watchful and faithful, or the contrary. Now, compare this with the third division of chapter 25, from verse 31—46, and all must see how exactly the one corresponds to the other. In the one, he states what rewards and punishments would be awarded, at his coming, to his servants; and in the other, he goes on to illustrate this by what may as justly be called the parable of the rewards and punishments, as the two former are called the parables of the ten virgins and talents. This agreement of chapters 24, 25, is not an accidental thing, but the effect of design, and clearly marked by the word "then," with which chapter 25 begins; but it is not noticed by most readers from the improper division of our Lord's discourse into chapters and verses. Our Lord no more ends his discourse, chapter 24, than Paul ends his Epistle to the Romans, chapter 4. If the

question is asked, when shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins? — the answer is found in chap. 24: 42, 44, 46, 50, where his coming is repeatedly mentioned, and in verse 34 is expressly said to be during that generation. We ask every candid man, Is not the Son of man, mentioned chap. 25: 31, the very same Son of man as is spoken of in chap. 24? And is not his coming in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, the same coming and glory as are mentioned chap. 24: 30? It was this perfect agreement of the three divisions of chap. 25 to the three things stated in chap. 24, which changed my views of this subject many years ago, so that they are not influenced by any change of opinions since.

Keeping these general remarks in view, let us attend to the words, "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." The first question is, Who shall go away into everlasting punishment? The context answers, the goats, verse 33, whose conduct is described, verses 41—46. The wicked and slothful servants, verses 24—29. The foolish virgins, verses 10—12. And the evil servants, chap. 24: 48, 49.

2d. Let us ask, What everlasting punishment were these persons to go away into? Answer: the everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels, verse 41. The outer darkness, verse 30. See, also, verse 10, and chap. 24: 51, all of which, it will be allowed, refer to the same punishment. In the first part of this Inquiry it has been shown that by the Devil and his angels, verse 41, our Lord referred to the unbelieving Jews and opposers of Christianity. In the Inquiry into the Words Sheol, Hades, &c., it has been also shown that fire is a figure often used in Scripture for temporal punishment, and is the same here, as hell fire in other places. In both Inquiries it has been shown that the term everlasting is applied to the punishment which the Jews are now enduring. In confirmation of these things, comp. Luke 13: 23—31; Matt. 8: 11, 12, 13, and 22: 13.

3d. Let us ask again, When were these persons to go away into everlasting punishment? The answer from the context evidently is, "When the Son of man came in his glory," verse 31. Well, when was this? Not at the end of this material world, for not a word is said about this in the two chapters. It was when the Lord of the servants came to reckon with them, verse 19. When the bridegroom came, verse 10. At the time when the slothful servants were not looking for him, chap. 24: 41—51. And at the time referred to, verse 44, when he said to his disciples, "Be ye also ready; for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." Christ's Father only knew of this day, verse 36. It was to come like a thief in the night, or like the flood on the old world, verses 37, 43. But it was certainly to come during that generation, verse 34. Then he was to reward every man according to his works; which exactly agrees to some going away into everlasting punishment, and some into life eternal.

But it will be asked, What throne of glory did Christ sit on when he came to take vengeance on the Jewish nation at the end of the age? The Greek, in chap. 25: 31, is, *tote kathisei epi thronou doxes autou*, and is the same which Matthew used, chap. 19: 28, and is rendered in both places by Dr. Campbell in the same way. The whole verse he renders thus, "Verily I say unto you that at the renovation, when the Son of man shall be seated on his glorious throne, ye my followers, sitting also upon twelve thrones, shall judge the twelve tribes of Israel." Here let the reader turn to the last section, and read the quotations made from Dr. Campbell and Macknight on this verse. These writers have shown that the coming of Christ was at the end of the Jewish dispensation; that the throne on which he sat was the throne of his mediatorial kingdom, and the judging then to take place, the ruling or governing men with his truth. His throne was no more a literal, visible throne, than were the twelve thrones of the apostles. The time when, the

nature of the throne, and similar language used in both cases by Matthew, show that there is no reference to a day of general judgment, as is generally supposed. If Matthew used this language, chap. 19: 28, as these writers explain it, by what fair rule of interpretation do we give the same words, chap. 25: 31, such a very different interpretation? What right, then, has any man to affirm that the Son of man's coming in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, refers to a day of general judgment, when the same writer, in the same book, has used the same or similar language, where it is manifest he is speaking of Christ's coming at the end of the Jewish age or dispensation? It is well known that the term rendered angel simply signifies a messenger of any kind; and it is allowed, on all hands, that angels are mentioned as connected with our Lord's coming at this period. See Matt. 24: 30, 31, and 16: 27; Mark 8: 38; 9: 1, and 13: 26, 27; Luke 21: 27. The angels being then mentioned, is a confirmation, not an objection to the views advanced. See Whitby and Macknight on Matt. 24, who show the angels to be human beings.

But it will be objected, How, upon your views, can it be said, "And before him shall be gathered all nations"? Answer; the phrase "all nations" occurs twice before in this very discourse of our Lord's, chap. 24: 9, 14. "And ye shall be hated of all nations for my name sake. And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come." What end shall come? Evidently the end of the Jewish age, verse 3, which took place about forty years after our Lord delivered this discourse. During this period the gospel was preached among all nations, Mark 13: 10, or throughout the Roman empire, which was then called the whole world, Luke 2: 1. See Matt. 28: 19, 20; Col. 1: 6, 23; Rom. 1: 8, and 10: 18. Judea was then a province of the Roman empire. That the apostles preached the gospel throughout the Roman

empire, and were hated of all nations, no one disputes. We have then found in this discourse, the all nations to be gathered before Christ seated on his mediatorial throne. It is obvious that whoever contends for a literal gathering together of all nations before him, ought also to contend that every individual of the same all nations heard the gospel, and that every individual of them hated the apostles for Christ's name sake. But how in this case could they have had any converts to their doctrine? And no separation could have taken place, for all the nations would have been goats. The gathering together of all nations before him, need not be extended to more than such as heard the gospel, and professed it, some of whom did, but others did not, bring forth its proper fruits. This limited view we think is favored by the scope of our Lord's discourse. For example, it was not the whole world, or all nations, but the kingdom of heaven, or Christ's professed disciples, who are likened unto the virgins, verse 1. Nor was it to all nations, but to his own servants, Christ delivered his goods, verse 14. See, also, chap. 24: 42—46. And the replies made to the king by both goats and sheep, proceed on the ground that they were both professors of his name. But it is not absolutely necessary to confine the sense of this phrase; for, since Christ sat down on his glorious throne, he has been judging the nations of the world in righteousness, and such of them as would not serve him, he has broken in pieces like a potter's vessel. But let us inquire,

1st. Were there any false professors in the kingdom of heaven when our Lord came at the end of the age? This needs no proof, for it is universally admitted. There were foolish virgins, and servants who had not improved their talents. See, also, chap. 24: 10—12. And see the epistles, for complaints made of professors by the apostles. When Christ came to reckon with his servants he found some faithful and watchful, but others saying, My Lord delayeth his coming, counting him an hard master, smiting their fellow-servants, and eating and drink-

ing with the drunken. When he ascended to God's right hand, he was like a man travelling into a far country to receive unto himself a kingdom. See Luke 19: 12—27. At the end of the age, he returned, having received his kingdom, and called his servants to an account of their conduct during his absence. Before he went away, he commanded all to be faithful and watchful. But such was the state in which he found the kingdom of heaven when he returned. The whole slumbered and slept. Many were found neither looking for nor prepared for his coming. He had forewarned them of the consequences, and this third division of chap. 25 sets forth the rewards and punishments which he then awarded to them. That much is said, in the New Testament, to excite their hopes and fears relative to our Lord's coming at the end of the Jewish dispensation, no one, we think, will question. But where do we find what our Lord promised or threatened, fulfilled, but in this very discourse, and which goes to show that the view I have given of it is substantially correct? But let us ask,

2d. Did a separation take place, at the end of the Jewish age, between true and false professors in the kingdom of heaven, or between the goats and sheep? Nothing can be more certain. This separation is described under other figures, such as a separation between chaff and wheat, Matt. 3: 12; Tares and wheat, and good and bad fishes, Matt. 13: 30—48. See, also, Matt. 8: 11, 12, and 16: 27, 28. Christ's fan purged his floor. The net then was drawn to shore, and the good and bad fishes separated. The tares were gathered to be burned, and the wheat into the garner. Indeed, none but such as endured to the end were saved; Matt. 24: 13. What is said about separating them as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats, is in allusion to the business of a shepherd, and to Christ, who is called the good shepherd, and his true disciples, sheep. His placing the sheep on the right hand, and the goats on the left, is probably in reference to judicial trials, as may be seen above in a

quotation from Jahn. The rule of judgment was, offices of kindness performed towards Christ's disciples. The similarity of the language used, chap. 24: 45, 46, and chap. 25: 34—41, deserves the reader's notice. In the first it is, "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing." And in the last, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom," &c. Comp. 2 Tim. 1: 15—18, and Rom. 16: 3, 4, as actual examples of such kind offices performed. But let us ask,

3d. What everlasting punishment and eternal life did those persons go away into after this separation? 1st. What everlasting punishment did the goats go away into? The same as the everlasting fire, verse 41, which in the one verse is expressed figuratively, and in the other plainly. This everlasting fire was prepared for the Devil and his angels, or the Jews, and the opposers of Christianity. To them was the Gospel first preached; by them it was first rejected, and for them this punishment is said to have been prepared. But, observe, it is not, like the kingdom for the righteous, said to have been prepared from the foundation of the world. What, then, was the everlasting fire or punishment prepared for the Jews, the avowed enemies of Christ and his Gospel; for these false professors are said to go away into the same punishment. I answer, the kingdom of God was taken from them; and I shall show, on 2 Thess. 1: 9, that they have been punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, in his worship and service. Blindness of mind, hardness of heart, and dreadful temporal judgments, have come on the Jews for nearly eighteen hundred years. In the Jewish use of the term everlasting, it may well be called an everlasting fire or punishment. It is, then, agreeable to fact, that those of the kingdom of heaven not found watchful and faithful, or bringing forth the fruits of the Gospel, did go away into, or have suffered, a similar punishment. Where are now the seven churches of Asia? Indeed, where is any church throughout what was then called the Roman empire? Their

candlestick is removed out of its place. Those nations have been given up to blindness of mind and hardness of heart very similar to the Jews, and that they have suffered severe temporal judgments none will deny. The most inveterate superstitions prevail among them. The nations who would not submit to him, or who have corrupted his religion after being favored with it, have suffered similar punishment, and it has been of such long continuance that it may well be called everlasting.

2d. But what life eternal did the righteous, or the sheep, go away into? As the everlasting punishment, verse 46, is the same as the everlasting fire, verse 41, so is the life eternal, verse 46, the same as the kingdom said to be prepared from the foundation of the world. What kingdom, then, was this? What kingdom could it be, but that which was taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles, called often the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God in the New Testament, and the kingdom likened unto the ten virgins, verse 1; the kingdom which Jesus went away to receive for himself when he ascended to the Father, and on the throne of which he is represented as sitting, and calling his servants to an account when he returned? This kingdom is called the everlasting kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and does not consist in meat and drink, but in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. That such a kingdom, or life eternal, was expected, is evident, for our Lord said, Luke 21: 31, 32, "When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled." And verse 28, "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." This kingdom, or life eternal, might be said to be prepared for them from the foundation of the world, for it was included in the promise of Christ from the beginning.

It is an unsupported assertion, from any part of our Lord's discourse, that this kingdom, or the life eternal

enjoyed by the righteous, is the happiness of the heavenly state. But the view I have given is amply supported both by it and other parts of Scripture. It is the same as going in with the bridegroom to the marriage, verse 10. And entering into the joy of their Lord, 21, 23. And to inherit this kingdom is to enjoy all the blessings and privileges of it. See Rom. 14: 17; Matt. 8: 11, 12, and Luke 22: 29, 30. My views, then, accord with the nature of the kingdom Christ received from the Father, the throne on which he sits, and his rule and government in it, and which, at the period called the end, he is to deliver up to God the Father. 1 Cor. 15: 24—28. To this kingdom he had a right to invite all those who endured to the end, chap. 24: 13, and to punish all those who said, "We will not have this man to rule over us."

It has long been considered one of the strongest arguments in favor of eternal misery, that the same Greek word is rendered here everlasting and eternal, and applied both to life and punishment. It is hence inferred that if the punishment is not endless, neither is life. Universalists do not admit this, for they adduce some texts where everlasting is used in the same verse, where it is allowed by their opponents that it is used both in a limited and unlimited sense. But if my views are found correct, it puts a final end to this argument and mode of reasoning, for everlasting is not used in either case to express endless duration. A brief sketch of my views of the phrase "everlasting life," has been given above, and some things may just be noticed here in confirmation of them.

1st. It is concluded by many that this chapter contains an account of the end of this world, and the day of judgment. But why is such a conclusion drawn? For, certainly, though it speaks of everlasting fire, everlasting punishment, and life eternal, it gives no intimation that these are suffered or enjoyed in another state of existence. The general usage of the word everlasting is

against such a conclusion; and it is beyond all debate that this term is applied in other texts to the temporal punishment of the Jews, which no one believes to be of endless duration. Besides, the whole scope of our Lord's discourse shows that here the word everlasting is used to express the duration of this very punishment, and is the fulfilment of what Daniel predicted, chap. 12: 2, considered above. This is confirmed from the word *kolasis*, here rendered punishment. Parkhurst says, it comes from *kolazo*, to punish, and it comes from *cla* in the Hebrew, which signifies to restrain. This punishment, then, is for the purpose of restraining the subjects of it, and not, as we are sometimes told, for "the glory of divine justice in their eternal misery;" or, that "the happiness of the righteous may be sweetened in seeing the smoke of their torment ascend up forever and ever." The sense given by Parkhurst to the above words is supported by their scripture usage. See 1 John 4: 18; Acts 4: 21; 2 Peter 2: 9. On this last text see my answer to Mr. Sabine. The word rendered punishment, in both places, is a confirmation of my opinions.

2d. The life eternal, verse 46, and the kingdom the righteous are called to inherit, verse 24, are the same, or the life eternal is to be enjoyed in this kingdom. It has then been shown above that eternal life was promised to Christ's disciples in the world to come, or the age of the Messiah, which certainly agrees to this passage. This passage is the fulfilment of what Christ promised, Mark 10: 30; Luke 18: 30; Matt. 19: 29, considered above. The Father appointed to Christ a kingdom, and he having returned from receiving it, his faithful followers enjoyed the life or happiness of it. They entered into the joy of their Lord, and shone forth like the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

It may be objected, "How could it be said, 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal,' if endless duration in a future state be not meant, for such persons could only live a few

years in this world either to suffer or enjoy?" See this objection noticed page 307. I would add here that it is certain everlasting is applied in Scripture both to punishment and enjoyment, when all allow endless duration is not meant. Why not so here, when we have seen that eternal life was to be enjoyed in the world to come, which is to end? That the present punishment of the Jews is called everlasting, no one can dispute, and, we think, has been shown, is the punishment referred to in this very passage. If the Jews, while in Canaan, enjoyed it successively in their generations as an everlasting possession, and now, cast out of it, endure in their generations an everlasting punishment, why not also believers enjoy eternal life, in a similar way, in the age of the Messiah? This life, I conceive, is not called eternal on account of its endless enjoyment by the individuals, but from its being a life connected with the kingdom of Christ, which is called an everlasting kingdom, which is to endure until the end, or resurrection of all the dead, and mortality shall be swallowed up of life. It is everlasting in a similar sense as the kingdom itself, or the gospel of this kingdom, which is called the everlasting gospel.

Is it further objected, "That Matthew 24 has a double meaning, first, in the destruction of Jerusalem during that generation, and, second, in the dissolution of this world and a day of general judgment?" But why not give it twenty meanings and accomplishments as well as two? And why not say the same of all the discourses which our Lord delivered? Our Lord declared, "All these things shall come on this generation;" but did he intimate that they were again to be fulfilled in a higher sense at a day of general judgment? No, nothing like this is said by him; and, without proof, such an objection does not require a serious refutation. At any rate, let the evidence for this be produced, and we will give it a serious consideration.

2 Thess. 1: 9. "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Let us consider,

1st. Who the persons were to whom Paul alluded when he said, "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction." Most people say, "All the wicked." The apostle and the Thessalonians knew who they were, to their painful experience, for they were the persons who troubled them, verse 6, and from whom their persecutions arose, verse 4. Who, then, persecuted and troubled them? The Thessalonians were persecuted by their own countrymen. 1 Epist. chap. 2: 14, 15. But their persecutions chiefly arose from the unbelieving Jews, as is evident from Acts 17: 5—7. Comp. 1 Thess. 2: 15. The whole New Testament shows this. But it is evident from the context. Let the question be asked, Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction? The answer is found, verse 8. Those "that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Was not this the case with the Jews? Comp. John 16: 3. God was to recompense tribulation, and to take vengeance on those that knew not God; and God's vengeance on the Jews is expressly called "The days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled." Luke 21: 22. Comp. also Luke 18: 7, 8; Rom. 12: 19. The connection between the 8th and 9th verses clearly shows that the vengeance to be taken on them that know not God, and who shall be punished with everlasting destruction, refers to the same persons, and the same punishment. And, in verse 6, it is said, it is a righteous thing with God "to recompense tribulation to them;" and which our Lord calls, Matt. 24: 29, "great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." Comp. verse 21. By troubling or persecuting Christians, the Jews were to fill up the measure of their iniquity, and bring upon themselves such tribulations. Accordingly, it is said, verse 5, "which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God." What is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God? The answer is, verse 4, the persecutions and tribulations which the Thessalonians

endured. But this only provokes the question, A manifest token of the righteous judgment of God upon whom? The answer evidently is, verse 6, upon them that troubled the Thessalonians, which we think, beyond all dispute, were the unbelieving Jews. Comp. Philip. 1: 28, where it is called "an evident token of perdition" to them. By pursuing such a course, the Jews fulfilled what our Lord predicted, and brought upon themselves all the righteous blood shed upon the earth. See Matt. 23: 34—36, and 1 Thess. 2: 16.

2d. Let us now consider at what time such persons were to be punished with everlasting destruction. If the persons were the unbelieving Jews, the answer is given already in the above remarks. It was at the destruction of Jerusalem. But let us examine the context, and we shall see this confirmed. The particular time specified is, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." Well, when was this to be? It is answered by the context, when he recompensed tribulation to the Jews who were the troublers of the Thessalonians; and was not this at the end of the age, when God's wrath came upon them to the uttermost? This period is expressly called the day when the Son of man is revealed, Luke 17: 30. Comp. Rom. 2: 5; 1 Peter 1: 5, 13; 4: 13—19, and 5: 1—5. This revelation is said to be "from heaven," and the angels are said to be connected with it, which exactly corresponds to what is said, Matt. 24: 30, 31. It has been shown that the term fire is used as a figure to express God's judgments on the Jewish nation. See Mal. 4: 1, &c. But there are some things mentioned in the context which were to take place at the same time, "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven," which are irreconcilable with the common views entertained of this passage, but which strongly confirm the explanation I have given of it.

1st. At this same time the Thessalonians were to obtain rest; for it is said, "And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from

heaven." The rest referred to was evidently rest from the persecutions they were enduring. See the context, and compare 2 Cor. 7 : 5, and Acts 9 : 31. If the day of judgment be the time referred to, then the Thessalonians are not to obtain rest from their persecutions until it arrives. But surely this cannot be, for long ago they found rest where all the weary find it, and hear no more the voice of the oppressor. Did the Thessalonians, then, find rest at the period when Jesus was revealed to take vengeance on the Jewish nation? Yes; this is a matter of history as well as fact. Our Lord, referring to this very period, said to his disciples, "When these things begin to come to pass, then lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh." Luke 21 : 28. Those who endured to the end were not only saved from the calamities which came on the Jews, but the Christians were at rest from their persecutions throughout the Roman empire. They were too much in trouble themselves, then, to trouble others.

2d. It is obvious that the Thessalonians were to obtain rest at the same time that God was to recompense tribulation to their troublers or persecutors. This is plain from verses 6, 7, quoted together: "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you who are troubled rest with us." And when were both these to take place? It is immediately added, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." If the end of this world be referred to, it is a plain case that God is not to recompense tribulation to those who troubled the Thessalonians until this period, nor until then are the Thessalonians to obtain rest. But the common belief is that the wicked are punished from the moment of their death until the day of judgment, and are to be punished forever after it. The common view of this text, therefore, must be abandoned.

3d. But the time when all this was to take place, is further designated, verse 10, which Macknight renders

thus: "In that day when he shall come to be glorified through his saints, and to be admired by all the believers; and by you, because our testimony was believed by you." Was Christ glorified, then, through his saints when he yielded vengeance on the Jews, in the destruction of their city and temple? We presume no one will question this. They obtained rest, they lifted up their heads, and shone forth like the sun in the kingdom of their Father. If believers glorified God when Saul, the persecutor, was converted to the faith, Galatians 1: 23, 24, how much more when they saw their persecutors generally removed, and "the Son of man coming in his kingdom," Matt. 16: 28, compare Rev. 15: 3, 4, and 11: 17. But all these things will be confirmed by considering,

3d. The nature and duration of the punishment here mentioned. 1st. Let us notice the nature of the punishment. It is called "destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." It will not be disputed that the punishment described in these words, is the same as the righteous judgment of God, mentioned verse 5, and called tribulation, verse 6, and the vengeance to be yielded, verse 8. Nor will it be questioned that the punishment described in all these verses is to be inflicted on the same persons. They are to be punished, and punished with everlasting destruction, yea, with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power. It is easily perceived that a correct understanding of the nature of the punishment depends on the meaning of the phrase,

Presence of the Lord. What then is the scriptural sense of this expression? The phrases, face of God, and face of the Lord, are the same in Scripture as presence of God, and presence of the Lord. By the presence of God, or presence of the Lord, in Scripture, is sometimes meant his omnipresence. David says, Ps. 139: 7, 8, "Whither shall I go from thy spirit? Or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell (*Sheol*),

behold thou art there," &c. Admitting, for argument's sake, that hell is a place of endless punishment, how could the wicked, even there, be out of God's presence? Yet in this passage the persons are said to be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord. Again; I find the phrase, presence of the Lord, refers to heaven, or the dwelling-place of the Most High. Christ is said to have gone "into heaven, now to appear in the presence of God for us," Heb. 9: 24. And it is said, Luke 1: 19, "I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God." But how could the wicked be punished with everlasting destruction from God's presence in this sense? For surely no one will say that they ever were in heaven, and, like Gabriel, stood in the presence of God. But again, the phrase face of God, or presence of the Lord, refers to some places where people met to worship him, and where he met with and manifested himself to them. Thus Jacob, at Penuel, Gen. 32: 30, says, "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." See Job 1: 6—12, and 2: 1—7, for examples of the same phrase, presence of the Lord. Unless there was some particular place where God was manifested in the days of Cain, how could it be said, "And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod (or vagabond, as in the margin) in the east of Eden"? Gen. 4: 16, and verse 14, it is added by Cain, "Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth: and from thy face shall I be hid."

It is very evident that the presence of the Lord was in a peculiar manner among the children of Israel. See Exod. 33: 14—17, compare Isai. 63: 9, and Psalm 51: 11. The tabernacle in the wilderness, and the temple at Jerusalem, were considered by the Jews as the peculiar residence of Jehovah. There he abode, and there they performed all their religious services to him. Jehovah was the God of the Jews; their land his land, and the temple there was considered the place of his im-

mediate presence. As this has an important bearing on the passage before us, we must give it a little more of our attention. In the temple at Jerusalem, God is said to dwell between the cherubim, Psalm 80. The show bread placed there is called "the loaves of the presence or faces." And, viewed in this light, the following texts have great beauty and force: "Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving, and make a joyful noise unto him with psalms. Serve the Lord with gladness; come before his presence with singing. Glory and honor are in his presence; strength and gladness are in his place." Psalm 95: 2, and 100: 2; 1 Chron. 16: 27. But that the land of Judea, and particularly the temple, was considered by the Jews as the place of God's peculiar presence, is manifest from Jonah 1: 3. "But Jonah rose up to flee unto Tarshish, from the presence of the Lord." Where he believed the Lord's presence to be, we learn from chapter 2: 4. "I am cast out of thy sight; but I will look again toward thy holy temple." In short, whether the Jews were in their own land, or in captivity, when they prayed or performed acts of worship to God, their thoughts and their faces were directed towards their temple at Jerusalem. See, in proof of this, Dan. 6: 10; 1 Kings 8; Psalm 5: 7.

But there are still some passages which deserve our particular notice, because they clearly decide what is the meaning of the phrase, presence of the Lord, in the passage before us. The first is, 2 Kings 13: 23, "And the Lord was gracious unto them, and had compassion on them, because of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and would not destroy them, neither cast them from his presence as yet." This was spoken of the Jews; and just notice that God speaks of destroying them, and casting them from his presence. What he here says that as yet he would not do to this people, in the following passage we find that he did do. 2 Kings 24: 20, "For through the anger of the Lord, it came to pass in Jerusalem and Judah until he had cast them out from his pres-

ence that Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon." The same is repeated, Jer. 52: 3, which I need not transcribe. God's presence was enjoyed by the Jews in Judea, and in their temple service. To be cast out of God's presence, is to be banished from Judea into captivity, and from all the privileges which the Jews enjoyed in their land, and temple worship. This was the same as destroying them. They were thus destroyed, or cast out of God's presence for seventy years in their captivity at Babylon. But they were brought back from this captivity, and again enjoyed God's presence in their own land. At the time Paul wrote the words before us, the time was drawing near when they were to be again cast out of God's presence, and dispersed among all nations. Of the Jews Paul spoke. He adopts the very language of the above passages, used in speaking of their former captivity, to describe the judgments of God which awaited them in their being cast out of their land, their city and temple destroyed, and they destroyed with an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord. The Jews now are just as certainly destroyed from the presence of the Lord, as they were during their seventy years' captivity. How, then, can any man affirm that Paul, in this passage, by destruction from the presence of the Lord, meant either annihilation or eternal misery? If the Scriptures are allowed to interpret themselves, Paul only describes the temporal destruction and banishment of the Jews, and in the very language by which the prophets had described their former punishments. It is added by the apostle, "and from the glory of his power," or as some render it, "his glorious power." Should this be understood of Jehovah, the God of Israel, it is certain his glorious power was displayed among the Jews. Should it be understood of Christ, it agrees with what is said of him; for at the destruction of Jerusalem he is said to have come in the glory of his Father; and he was then to be seen coming with power and great glory, Matt. 16: 27, and 24: 30. But it will be said, How is this de-

struction of the Jews called an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, if it refers merely to temporal calamities? I shall now,

2d. Notice the duration of their punishment. It is the word everlasting, which is here, and in other places, applied to punishment, which leads many good people to conclude that it is in another world, and is of endless duration. But, so far from this being true, this very application of the word everlasting is a strong confirming circumstance in proof of the views advanced; for, first, it has been shown at length that *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios*, are rendered everlasting, and, in a great many instances at least, are used to express limited time. But, second, these words are rendered everlasting, and applied to the very temporal punishment which the Jews have endured for eighteen hundred years, and are still enduring. For example, it is said, Jer. 23 : 39, 40, "Therefore, behold, I, even I, will utterly forget you, and I will forsake you, and the city that I gave you and your fathers, and cast you out of my presence; and I will bring an everlasting reproach upon you, and a perpetual shame which shall not be forgotten." See my Inquiry into the Words Sheol, Hades, &c., on this passage. Compare also Deut. 28 : 37, and 31 : 17, 18; Hosea 9 : 17; Jer. 20 : 11, and 24 : 9. What only remains to be accounted for is, why is this temporal punishment of the Jews called everlasting, both by the prophet, and by Paul in this passage? This we think is easily and rationally accounted for. Paul was a Jew, and was speaking of Jews and their punishment. What could be more proper than to speak of their punishment in the language in which it was described by their own prophets, as a destruction, and an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord? The Jews were familiar with the language of their Scriptures; but what Jew ever understood that to be cast out of God's presence was to be cast into misery in a future state; or, that the word everlasting, applied to it, expressed its endless duration?

No man, we think, will assert this. It is of no consequence how Christians have understood either the phrase, presence of the Lord, or the word everlasting, for ages past; but the question is, How did the Jews understand it? In their use of the term, their present punishment is called everlasting with stricter propriety than many other things to which they were accustomed to apply it. Should the punishment of the Jews end to-morrow, its continuance for eighteen hundred years might be called everlasting. But how long it is yet to continue, God only knows. All the exertion made to convert them is little else than lost labor. The veil is on their hearts, and they are an everlasting reproach, and a perpetual shame among all the nations of the earth. What nation ever suffered so long and severe a destruction as they have done? And what nation ever enjoyed such privileges, and yet remain so long a blinded and unbelieving people? But their punishment is to end; for as certainly as God has concluded them all in unbelief, so he is to have mercy upon all. Their everlasting destruction is not of endless duration.

1st. Is it objected, "How could the Jews, who persecuted Christians at Thessalonica, suffer this punishment, seeing they lived so far distant from Jerusalem"? Answer: it could have made no difference in the case, had they lived at the poles; for at the destruction of Jerusalem the Jews were banished Judea, and have not been allowed to return to this day. Even the few Jews in Judea now do not enjoy the presence of the Lord. They live there without a temple, an altar, or a sacrifice, and mourn over the long desolations of their city and temple; dragging out a miserable existence in hopeless expectation that their Messiah is yet to come. But many of the foreign Jews suffered at the destruction of their city and temple; for it was at the feast of the passover, when they were generally assembled there, that Titus surrounded the city, and they could not escape.

2d. Is it objected, "The presence of the Lord means

his gracious presence at the day of judgment; and being destroyed from his presence, being banished to hell at this period"? Answer: let this be proved, for assertions prove nothing. Not a word is said, in the whole context of the passage, about a day of judgment, or God's gracious presence.

3d. Is it objected, "Your views of this passage do not agree with the coming of Christ mentioned chapter 2: 1, of this epistle; for it is his coming at the day of judgment, and you have interpreted his coming, in chapter 1, of his coming at the destruction of Jerusalem"? Answer: whoever will consult Whitby, may see that he interprets Christ's coming, in chapter 1, of the day of judgment, but passes it very slightly; but he enters at large into the proof that Christ's coming, chapter 2, refers to his coming to destroy Jerusalem. Whitby then shows that chapter 2 is in accordance with my views of chapter 1.

Matt. 18: 8. The "everlasting fire" here mentioned, is the same as hell fire, verse 9, for they are used as convertible expressions; and the same as everlasting fire, Matt. 25: 41. See Inquiry into the words Sheol, Hades, &c., for an illustration of this text, and which has been also noticed in the present Inquiry. It requires no further attention.

Jude 7. "Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." That the suffering the vengeance of eternal fire here has no reference to punishment in a future state, appears to me evident from the following considerations:

1st. From comparing 2 Peter 2: 6, where nothing is said about eternal fire, but only that the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, with the people together, are said to be condemned with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly. Had the people gone to endless misery, would Peter have omitted

this important part, and mentioned only the destruction of the cities, with the loss of their lives, as an example to ungodly men? We cannot very readily admit this.

2d. By comparing verses 5, 6, 7, together, Jude says that the people to whom he wrote knew that Sodom and Gomorrah suffered the vengeance of eternal fire. But I ask how they could know that they suffered in a future state of existence? For neither the history of the event, nor any other part of Scripture could give them such information. Compare Zeph. 2: 9. But they could know that the people of Sodom and Gomorrah suffered temporal misery, for this is plainly made known.

3d. Jude says they were set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. But how could they be an example, if this refers to punishment in a future state? for an example to others must be visible, to be of any benefit to them. Their destruction with the cities is an example, for these are facts allowed by sacred and profane writers, Jewish and heathen. See Philo, Josephus, the Apocryphal writers, and others, who all mention those events. It is allowed by many intelligent men that nothing is said in the Old Testament about eternal punishment. The cities of the plain burnt for many ages, which sufficiently entitled this fire to be called "the vengeance of eternal fire." This fire might be called eternal, in the same or similar sense as the desolation of certain cities and places was to be perpetual or everlasting. See, among others, the following places: Ezek. 26: 20, 21; 35: 9; Jer. 18: 15, 16; 23: 40, and 51: 39. This has been shown above. I may add that *puros aioniou* might be rendered "of the fire of the age." The apostle then says that they suffered the vengeance of the fire, or punishment, of the age; fire being a figure for punishment. Or, simply, they suffered the vengeance of the fire of old.

4th. Whitby and others, who believed the Devil to be a real being, maintain that he is not suffering, nor will suffer, the torments of hell until after the day of judg-

ment. Why, then, send the Sodomities there before him? God must be very merciful to the Devil, to excuse him so long a time from eternal misery, yet send all the Sodomites there when he burnt up their city.

Jude 13. "Raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness forever." Peter states, for substance, the same, second epistle, 2: 17, which has been noticed in my answer to Mr. Sabine, to which I refer the reader. There it has been shown that the apostle referred to the Jews, and the darkness they are now in; and that it may be said to be forever, in the Jewish usage of this expression. That their present punishment is called everlasting, we think has been proved from several texts above.

Mark 3: 29 has been considered in connection with Matt. 12: 31, 32, above, and requires no further notice.

Heb. 6: 2. "Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." It requires no proof that Paul was addressing himself to believing Hebrews. At verse 11, of chapter 5, he said that he had many things to say to them concerning Melchisedec, hard to be uttered, or not easily understood by them, because they were dull of hearing, or slow in learning. Accordingly, in verses 12—14, he reproved them thus:—"For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness; for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." By "the oracles of God" Paul evidently referred to the Old Testament Scriptures, particularly the law given at Sinai. See Acts 7: 38, and Rom. 3: 2. He could not refer to the New Testament Scriptures, for, at the time he wrote, they were not

all written; nor does it appear that this appellation is ever applied to them. By the first principles, must be meant, some things in the Old Testament, for they are said to be the first principles of the oracles of God. This is evident from the word *stoiheia*, rendered first principles, Gal. 4: 3, 9, where, instead of elements in the text, our translators have put rudiments in the margin. In Col. 2: 8, 20, they have rendered this same word rudiments, and have put elements in the margin. The same word is rendered elements, 2 Peter 3: 10, 12, which, we think could be shown, refers to things belonging to the Jewish dispensation. It is apparent, from these texts, that it signifies the elements, rudiments, or first principles of the oracles of God, or things which belonged to the Jewish dispensation. These were suited to the world while in a state of childhood, but, after Christ had come, ought to have been laid aside. But many Jewish converts to Christianity turned back again to these weak and beggarly elements, whereunto they deserved again to be in bondage. This was the case with the believing Hebrews; for, instead of being in advance of the Gentile converts, having had the rudiments in their hands from their childhood, they needed even to be taught them again. They were babes, preferring milk to strong meat, or those rudiments, to being skilful in the word of righteousness, and having their senses exercised to discern both good and evil. See chapter 5: 12—14, and compare Gal. 4: 1—4.

Let us now notice the first two verses of chapter 6: "Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection." In the margin it is, "Therefore, leaving the word of the beginning of Christ," which evidently refers to the first principles of the oracles of God, chapter 5: 12, the word "therefore" shows that the apostle drew his inference from what he had just stated, chapter 5: 12—14. It could not refer to the word of the beginning of Christ, taught by him or his apostles; for surely Paul would not command them

to leave what Christians are commanded to hold fast and continue in. See 1 John 2: 24; 1 Cor. 15: 1—4. Nor, was this the beginning of the word of Christ, unless we affirm that nothing is said of Christ in the Old Testament. But to him gave all the law and the prophets witness. Besides, could the apostle mean to tell the Hebrews that they could not go on unto perfection unless they left the beginning of the word of Christ? This, we think, is impossible. But, by leaving the first principles of the oracles of God as taught in the Old Testament, they could only go on to perfection, for it was by adhering to those rudiments, after Christ had come, that their progress in knowledge had been retarded. Instead of leaving them, they began to lay them again as a foundation, or returned to those weak and beggarly elements, deserving again to be in bondage to them. Is it asked, How can the different articles here specified, and which they are desired not to lay again as a foundation, be the first principles of the oracles of God, as taught in the Old Testament? I shall now attempt to show this, by briefly noticing those articles.

1st. "*Not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works.*" That repentance was required under the Old Testament dispensation needs no proof, and therefore this part occasions no difficulty. Probably a reference is here made to that which was enjoined on the great day of atonement, Lev. 16: 21, 22, 29, 30.

2d. "*And of faith towards God.*" But why not faith towards Christ, if the apostle did not refer to the principles of the Old Testament? It is well known that the faith of persons during that dispensation chiefly respected God. See Heb. 11: 6; John 14: 1. This part can occasion no difficulty.

3d. "*Of the doctrine of baptisms.*" Christian baptism is always spoken of in the singular. But, when the Jewish baptisms or washings are mentioned in the New Testament, they are spoken of, as here, in the plural number. See as examples (in the Greek), Mark

7: 4, 8. And Paul, in this very epistle, chapter 9: 10, calls them divers baptisms. This so plainly belongs to the Old Testament that we may conclude all the other things refer to the same dispensation.

4th. "*And of laying on of hands.*" This article can occasion no difficulty, for it is well known that laying on of hands was common under the Jewish dispensation, and that on various occasions. It is no objection to my view that this and some of the other things were also done under the gospel dispensation.

5th. "*Of the resurrection of the dead.*" This is commonly understood of the general resurrection. But why should it? If the preceding articles refer to things under the old dispensation, why not this and the article which follows? Then certain persons were raised from the dead, and that the apostle refers to them in chapter 11: 35, is indisputable. Elijah raised the widow's son of Zarephath, 1 Kings 17: 20—24. Elisha raised the Shunamite's son, 2 Kings 4: 32—36. These with other instances of the power of God were a great confirmation of the truth of Judaism, and confirmed the faith of believers in it; yea, exhibited the excellency of faith in God during that dispensation. Compare Heb. 11: 35, with 1 Kings 17: 24. And whatever promoted their faith towards God, led to repentance from dead works. But, that the term *anastasis*, rendered resurrection, was used among the Jews to express a revival in various ways, is shown by Dr. Campbell, previously quoted. The restoration of Israel is described as raising dead dry bones to life, Ezek. 37: 1—14. And with equal propriety might the deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Pharaoh be called a resurrection from the dead. Hence they said to Moses, Exod. 14: 11, "Because there were no graves in Egypt hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness?" That by the dead, in Scripture, we are sometimes to understand not those actually dead, but only being in danger of it; and a deliverance out of such a state, a resurrection, is allowed. See, among other

texts, the following: Genesis 20:3; 2 Sam. 19:28; 2 Cor. 1:8—10; Rom. 11:15; John 5:28, 29.

6th. "*And of eternal judgment.*" That the term judgment is used to express temporal judgment in Scripture, needs no proof. That the ancient Jewish religion was established by great temporal judgments is indisputable, as the five books of Moses show. And that the judgment of God on the Egyptians, when Israel were delivered from their bondage, is called eternal or forever, is expressly declared. Hence it is said, Exod. 14:13, "For the Egyptians whom ye have seen to-day, ye shall see them again no more forever." See above, on the word *olim*, as used in the Old Testament. Acordingly, the phrase *krimatos aioniou*, eternal judgment, may be rendered, of the judgment of the age, or, the judgment of old. In this sense, we have seen *olim*, *aion* and *aionios*, used in Scripture. I may just add that the context seems to confirm the view given of this passage. In verse 3 it is said, "and this will we do if God permit." Do what? let it be asked. Answer: "Go on unto perfection," as stated verse 1. If the first principles spoken of were such as belonged to the Old Testament, it was altogether unnecessary for Paul to teach them, for this would be laying them again as a foundation. But it was highly proper for him to go on to teach what would render them perfect or full-grown men, seeing they were so deficient in the knowledge of Christ Jesus. This, in fact, he did in this very epistle, for a great part is spent in pointing out to them the reality of that of which the Jewish law was but a shadow. But what was to prevent his doing this? for he says, "this will we do if God permit." This Paul purposed to do, if God gave him opportunity, and if his purpose and labors were not frustrated by their total apostasy from the faith before his letter came to them. Hence his fears about this, in verses 4—9. See, also, chapter 10:23—39.

Rev. 14:11. "And the smoke of their torments ascendeth up forever and ever, and they have no rest day

nor night." And 19:3, "And again they said, Alleluia, and her smoke rose up forever and ever." And 20:10, "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever." It would be idle to show that these passages have no respect to punishment in another state of existence. No well-informed man would urge them as proof of such a doctrine; for it is plain that the punishments were in this world, where time is measured by day and night.

Such are all the texts in the Bible where *olim*, *aion* and *aionios*, are used, in whatever way rendered by our translators. Not one text has been omitted to our knowledge; and the reader, having the whole ground before him, may examine it for himself. The texts on which dependence is placed, proving the doctrine of endless punishment, we have fully considered, and to spend time with others is unnecessary.

SECTION VIII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS ON OLIM, AND AION, AND AIONIOS, RENDERED EVERLASTING, FOREVER, ETC., THROUGHOUT THE BIBLE, WHETHER APPLIED TO GOD, TO LIFE, OR PUNISHMENT.

If these terms are ever used to express endless duration, all seem to be agreed that they express the endless duration,—

1st. *Of God.* Indeed, it is from their being applied to him, who is without beginning or end, that it is concluded they express endless duration when applied to

other things. This point, then, requires to be examined with modesty and care. It would ill become me to speak with dogmatical confidence on such a subject. All I claim is that what has occurred to me be considered impartially, and it may lead to a more complete investigation of the subject. There is no dispute, nor can there be any, about the endless existence of Jehovah. The only point about which a question arises is, are these terms intended to express his endless duration, when so applied? If they do, it must, I think, be allowed that it is the subject to which they are applied which gives them this extent of signification; and it is certain, beyond a doubt, that they are often used in Scripture to express a limited duration, — yea, sometimes a short period, such as a person's life-time. Besides, does it follow that, because God is infinite, words must derive an infinite signification when applied to him? If they do, why confine it to the words before us? Why not also say that when the term good is applied to God, it must always mean an infinite degree of goodness? which, if true, puts an end to the doctrine of eternal misery, for it is expressly said, "The Lord is good unto all." So in regard to other terms being applied to him. But what leads me to think that *olim*, *aion* and *aionios*, used to express duration when applied to the divine being, were not intended to designate his endless duration, are the following things:

1st. From the original native sense of these terms. Lexicon writers seem to be agreed that they signify eternity, not from their natural native sense, but from the subjects to which they are applied, and the sense of certain passages requiring such an application of them. They all allow that they not only signify limited duration, but are used to express this in Scripture. I would therefore query whether we ought to take it for granted that certain passages, in which such words are used, require us to understand them as expressing endless duration? May not these passages be misunderstood? And,

when duly considered, we may see that they do not require such a sense affixed to these terms. Is it correct reasoning to infer that terms expressing limited duration cannot be applied to God without changing their meaning from a limited to an infinite signification? Why may not these terms, which are certainly used to express all the ages of the world from its beginning to its end, be also used, when applied to God, to express, not his endless duration, but the period of his dispensations and dealings with men through Jesus Christ, throughout all the generations of it? For example, when God is called "the king eternal," we have seen, by a quotation from Macknight, that it simply signifies king of the ages, or of all the ages or dispensations of this world.

2d. Supposing, then, these terms, when applied to God, do not express his endless duration, but all the period of his dispensations with men in this world, there is a propriety and congruity in all their applications throughout the Scriptures. They are then used to express a longer or shorter period, as the subject of the writer required. They express the period of a man's life-time, the duration of any one of the dispensations under which men have been placed, or all the ages of the world from its beginning to its end. Accordingly, these terms are used in a variety of ways to express limited duration, as is universally allowed. To understand them as expressing endless duration, would make the inspired writers, in many instances, speak the most palpable absurdities and contradictions.

3d. If these terms, when applied to God, are used to express his endless existence, I beg leave to ask why qualifying explanatory phrases are added by the sacred writers, as is so frequently done? I shall explain myself about this. For example, when *olim* is used to express time past, it is not only rendered of old, the days of old, ancient, ancient years, former years, but is explained to mean many generations, the years of many generations, and from the beginning. Again, when it is

used to express future time, we have also the following explanatory phrases given us concerning it: all thy days, throughout your generations, throughout all generations, to all generations, from generation to generation, many generations, every generation, the tenth generation, and a thousand generations. Besides, it is also limited or qualified by the duration of the sun, moon, host of heaven, and days of heaven. Had this word signified endless duration, all must have seen the propriety of adding such explanations when it was used to express a limited duration, for this was necessary to prevent misunderstanding. But what need was there to add the same or similar explanations when this term is applied to God? Why not let it have its full, unqualified meaning, if it really signified endless duration? But the sacred writers make no distinction, for they add the same restricting, qualifying expressions when it is applied to him, as when speaking of anything else, as seen above from the passages where *olim* occurs. Indeed, if this word signifies endless duration, it was necessary to give such explanations when used to express a temporary duration, but surely altogether unnecessary when speaking of God.* If persons will have it that the subject to which *olim* is applied determines whether it is to be understood in a limited or endless sense, let them account for the fact that such qualifying phrases are used when it is applied to God. What was their use or intention in such a connection? Yea, I ask, ought we not, rather, to have had some phrases showing that *olim*, when applied to God, was to be understood in its most unlimited sense? This was necessary, seeing the word did not signify endless duration of itself, was applied so often to express limited duration, and was attended with such qualifying phraseology in so many instances. At any rate, when *olim* was applied to God, why were not such restricting phrases omitted? This would have been leaving the subject to which it is applied to determine the extent of its meaning, without any drawback from such limiting phrases.

Were such phrases introduced for no purpose? But if introduced for the purpose of limiting or explaining *olim*, in the one case, no candid man will question but they were introduced for the same purpose in the other. For example, the priesthood of Aaron is called an everlasting priesthood; but this is explained by the phrase, "throughout your generations." So in other instances. Well, when it is said of God, "His mercy is from everlasting to everlasting," it is added, by way of explanation, "His righteousness unto children's children." Psalm 103: 17. Again, when it is said, "Thou art from everlasting," this is again explained by the words, "Thy throne is established of old." Psalm 93: 2. When it is said, "Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom," we find it explained thus, "And thy dominion endureth throughout all generations." Psalm 145: 13. And when it is said, "His mercy is everlasting," it is again added, as an explanation, "and his truth endureth to all generations." Give me leave to ask, if everlasting means endless duration, why are all these qualifying explanatory phrases added? Had the word *olim*, rendered everlasting, meant endless duration, and such qualifying phrases only been added when it is applied to things of a temporary nature, this would only be guarding the application of the term from abuse. But we see that such explanatory expressions are given when it is applied to God. Now, if the term was intended to express his endless duration, why was this the case? Why not omit them in all instances where he is spoken of, and only use them where this term is applied to things of limited duration? Had this been done, it would have shown that the inspired writers did use a word which expressed endless duration, and judged it proper to guard its misapplication by such qualifying expressions. But if we consider the word *olim* as expressing limited and not endless duration, all the qualifying phrases used are proof that in this sense the sacred writers wished themselves to be understood by their readers. Is the question then asked, What is the limit

of time expressed by this word? So far as I can see, it is expressed by the qualifying expression, "throughout all generations."

4th. The very repetition of *olim*, rendered "forever and ever," seems to show that it was not designed to express God's endless duration. If forever, by itself, did express an endless duration of time, why add another forever to it? This was altogether superfluous, for twenty forevers added could not add to endless duration. How could adding another forever make the first forever, or both taken together, an endless duration of time? Add as many forevers as you please to one another, if the first expresses a limited period, the number added must still fall infinitely short of eternity. They may make up a very long period of time, but still one which must come to an end. But I will leave it for candid men to consider if the adding of one forever to another does not fairly imply that the sacred writers never intended to express endless duration by this mode of speaking. Many people seem to think that "forever and ever" expresses endless duration; but, if duly considered, we think it leads to the reverse conclusion, for the very repetition of forever implies that the first forever was of limited duration. This is confirmed by considering that "forever and ever" is indiscriminately applied to things which are to end, and to God himself. Besides, the sacred writers give us the same explanations, or qualifying phrases, in both cases when they use this language. In short, whether "forever and ever" is applied to God, or to things of temporary duration, they guard us against understanding it as meaning a proper eternity. It is throughout all generations, and as long as days shall be measured by the host of heaven.

But if "forever," or, "forever and ever," is used to express endless duration, why speak of a period beyond this? Thus, in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, other words are joined with it, which effectually restrict its meaning. Thus, Exod. 15: 18, The Lord

shall reign forever and ever and further. Dan. 12: 3, They shall shine as the stars forever and further. Mic. 4: 5, We will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and beyond it. See Unitarian Miscel., vol. ii. p. 33. The translators of this version seem to have thought that there was a period beyond forever and forever and ever.

I am aware that to all this it will be objected, Does not David say, Psalm 9: 2, "Even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God," and does not this express the endless existence of God, both as to past and future? Is it not as if he had said, "thou art from infinite duration that is past, to infinite duration to come?" Plausible as this appears, when these words of David are attended to, they rather go to confirm the views which have been advanced. Hallet, in his Notes, vol. i. pp. 75, 76, thus writes: "Psalm 41: 13, 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from everlasting, and to everlasting. Amen and Amen.' I am apt to think that many English readers suppose that the words 'from everlasting,' signified a duration that was past in the days of the psalmist. But, on second thoughts, the English reader will perceive that this cannot possibly be. The psalmist here expresses his desire that God may be blessed. But it is impossible to desire that God may be blessed heretofore. To say, blessed be God in past ages, would be as ridiculous as the advice a late divine has given Christians, to pray that the one Catholic church may be built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. The text, then, must be rendered, 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel from age to age, namely, from this time forth throughout all ages.' Every one will allow that the Hebrew word, *olim*, here rendered 'everlasting,' does frequently signify an age, or generation. Nor will any one object to this interpretation of the word, 'and from everlasting and to everlasting,' as if this would hinder us from rendering the expression, 'from age to age,' when he shall consider that the word

and, in such like expressions, is redundant or superfluous in our language, whatever grace it adds to the Hebrew phrase. Thus, the Hebrew expression, 2 Chron. 9: 26, is literally to be rendered, 'from the river and unto the land of the Philistines.' Our translators have rendered the Hebrew particle by 'even'; 'from the river even unto the land of the Philistines.' It would have been as well if they had dropt it quite, and had said, 'from the river to the land of the Philistines.' See, also, 2 Chron. 30: 5. So, also, the passage of the Psalm under consideration may be rendered, 'Blessed be God from age even to age,' or, more simply, 'from age to age.' In the same sense the expression is to be understood, Psalm 103: 17, 'The mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting,' or, rather, from age to age, namely, from this age to the next, and so on throughout all future ages. In the same manner, I conjecture, we must understand this same expression, Psalm 90: 2, which I would render thus, 'Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth or the world, and from age to age, thou art God.'"

But it is likely to be further objected, that if "forever and ever" is not admitted as expressing the endless existence of God, is not this attempting to do away his endless existence? I would answer, by no means; for his endless existence is altogether independent of such terms as these, and why give a wrong meaning to Scripture in support of this doctrine? Is there no other way of establishing the eternity of God's existence but by means of these words? If there is not, we should hardly think the inspired writers would have used such qualifying language in connection with them, when they applied them to God. Instead of modifying, they would have added some additional phrase, to show that they wished to be so understood.

We think no considerate man will affirm that *aion*, or *aionios*, of the New Testament, can express endless duration, unless *olim*, of the Old, expresses such a duration.

The New Testament writers in no case intimate that *olim* of the Old Testament signifies limited, but that *aion* and *aionios*, of the New, mean eternal duration. On the contrary, they use these words, in several instances, as a correct expression of what is to be understood by *olim* in the Old Testament.

2d. But it is further supposed that *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios*, rendered "everlasting," must mean endless duration, when applied to life; and everlasting life is considered to be the never-ending life, enjoyed beyond this mortal existence. If we have counted correctly, the phrases *zoen aionion*, *zoe aionios*, *zoes aioniou*, and *aionios zoe*, occur just forty-three times in the New Testament. They are rendered everlasting life, eternal life, life everlasting, and life eternal; but all mean the same thing, as is evident from comparing, in the Greek, John 17: 2, with verse 3, and other passages. This phraseology is peculiar to the New Testament, as it occurs only Daniel 12: 2, and in reference to the age of the Messiah. Had it referred to a life common to believers under the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, why was this the case? If it means, as most Christians believe, the life or happiness of the heavenly state, Old Testament saints must have known it, for they looked for this. See Heb., chap. 11. But they are never said to have it, to have it abiding in them, or even to hope for it, which is often said of New Testament believers. Besides, though all the prophets bore witness to Christ, yet he is never called "eternal life" by any of them, as by the New Testament writers. The reason seems to be that this title referred to his manifestation in the flesh; hence John calls him "that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us." This agrees to its being said that eternal life was to be enjoyed in "the world to come," or "the age of the Messiah," which the orthodox critics say "began at his first advent and shall be completed at his second coming." The word everlasting, added to life, proves nothing about its enjoyment in a

future state, or its endless duration, for the New Covenant is called everlasting. The kingdom, reign, and priesthood of Christ, are called everlasting. But does this mean endless duration? This kingdom Christ received, and he is again to deliver it up to God the Father. Hence the Jews say "that the kingdom of the Messiah shall return to its first author." And shall not his priesthood, called an everlasting priesthood, cease when he shall have none to intercede for, and his reign end when all are subdued, and God be all in all? His priesthood shall not pass away, like that of Aaron's, nor his kingdom like other kingdoms of this world, but shall continue while sun and moon endure. The life enjoyed in this kingdom is called everlasting life, and the consolation in it everlasting consolation. In short, I conceive that all the everlastings of which the Scriptures speak, stand in some shape or other connected with God's dispensation of love and mercy to man through Jesus Christ. The ages or everlastings began with it, and shall terminate when Christ hath subdued all things, and the last enemy, death, is destroyed. Hence the state after this does not appear to me to be described in Scripture by the expression, "everlasting life," but by other words and phrases. For example, the dead are said to put on incorruption or immortality. Mortality is then to be swallowed up of life. They cannot die any more, but are equal unto the angels; being sons of the resurrection, their inheritance is incorruptible and fadeth not away, and they are to be (*pantote*) forever with the Lord.

The phrase "everlasting life," occurs only once in the Old Testament, but is of frequent occurrence in the New. But why was this the case, and why is it spoken of as a thing enjoyed upon believing in Jesus, and as connected with his reign or kingdom, which is to end, if it designated the life and enjoyment beyond the resurrection of the dead? Besides, it is set in contrast with the everlasting punishment, into which the Jews and others were sent for nearly eighteen hundred years, as shown above.

It never can be proved that it is ever contrasted with eternal death, or a punishment after the resurrection of all the dead. But this ought to have been its contrast, and contrasted as often as everlasting life is contrasted, if the common doctrine be true. Were the inspired writers so perfectly indifferent about the eternal death of their fellow-creatures, that they did not think it worth while once to mention it? They were, surely, not so much alarmed about this as many modern preachers are; for eternal life and eternal death are their constant themes, and they cannot deny that these expressions are used by them, in contrast, to describe the endless felicity and misery of men in a future state. But where did they learn this? Not from their Bible, for it contains no such contrasts. Such men must presume a great deal on the ignorance and credulity of their hearers, who think to make their sayings pass for the declarations of Jehovah.

3d. The term everlasting is also applied to punishment, and it is confidently affirmed that it expresses the endless duration of it. The places where it is so applied are few in number, and can easily be counted by the reader, as they have all been laid before him. Such of them, on which dependence is placed in proof of the doctrine of endless punishment, have been fully and particularly considered. For example, Matt 15: 46, and 2 Thess. 1: 9, the strongholds of this doctrine, have been razed to the foundations. It has been proved, we think, that, so far from those passages teaching the doctrine of endless punishment, they do not even teach a punishment beyond this life. If these two texts fail in supporting it, it is useless to attempt its defence from any other part of Scripture.

To conclude. We have attempted to examine the common doctrines of the devil and eternal punishment with all the candor and fairness we could command. It has resulted in the fullest conviction that these doctrines are not taught in Scripture, but are the production of the wisdom of this world, which is foolishness with God, and

which cometh to naught. Persuaded the more the Scriptures are examined this will the more clearly appear, we have published our views on the subject, hoping it will be pursued by others, who have more time and better talents, to throw additional light upon it. We can sincerely say we have sought after the truth, and from the love of truth, for this only can stand when all human devices in religion shall fail. If we have not found the truth, but have embraced error, we hold ourselves in readiness to attend to whatever can be said on the other side. Truth can never suffer by calm, candid discussion; but error shuns the light, deprecates investigation, and is ever ready to cry heresy, and that the church is in danger.*

* De Quincey, one of the most popular writers of the age, devotes one of his Theological Essays in vol. I. to a consideration of the "Supposed Scriptural Expression for Eternity." He takes strong ground against the popular signification of *aion* and *aionios;* and after showing that they did not signify endless, he answers the objection, that if we say punishment is not endless, we must also say happiness is not. He says, "I, separately, speaking for myself only, profoundly believe that the Scriptures ascribe absolute and metaphysical eternity to one sole Being, viz., to God; and derivatively to all others according to the interest which they can plead in God's favor. Having anchorage in God, innumerable entities may possibly be admitted to a participation in divine *aeon*. But what interest in the favor of God can belong to falsehood, to malignity, to impurity? To invest *them* with *aeonian* privileges is, in effect, and by its results, to distrust and to insult the Deity. Evil would *not* be evil if it had that power of self-subsistence which is imputed to it in supposing its *aeonian* life to be coëternal with that which crowns and glorifies the good." O. A. S.

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE POSSESSIONS OF DEVILS, MENTIONED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In the first part of this work it has been shown that the terms Devil and Satan, in the Bible, do not designate an evil spirit — an angel who fell from heaven. We shall now inquire if the devils, with which persons were supposed to be possessed, are evil spirits who fell with him, as many believe. It is often said, in the New Testament, that certain persons were possessed with a devil, and one man declared that he had a legion of them within him. But no such statements are to be found in the Old Testament, nor do we find any such things in the present day. In the apostolic age these devils were supposed to inflict madness and other disorders on men; yet no person imputes the same evils to them in the present day. Are such devils all dead? Have they lost their power to inflict such disorders? Are they all turned good devils; or have we been mistaken in what is said in the New Testament about them?

It is very certain the word devil misleads the English reader. The Greek words, *diabolos*, *daimon*, *daimonion*, are all rendered, in the common version of the New Testament, by this word devil, and, in the plural, devils. But the last two words are essentially different in meaning from the first, and in modern translations are rendered demon, and, in the plural, demons. The three words are never used to express the same being or thing by

the sacred writers. They never intimate that any person was possessed with *diabolos*, the devil. The devil is spoken of as one, and is only used in the plural number when speaking of human beings. But the demons are spoken of as many, and were cast out of persons. *Diabolos* is never said to be cast out of any person. This marked distinction between the devil and demons is lost in our common English version; for *diabolos*, *daimon* and *daimonion*, are all rendered by our English word devil.

If the terms devil and satan do not designate an angel who fell from heaven, the presumption is, demons are not angels who fell with him. It is very certain no such thing is taught in the Bible, and, if not found there, how came it to be known that demons are fallen angels? Some suppose demons to be the product of a union of angels with the daughters of men. Others, as a race of malignant and mischievous spirits; and we shall see they are deemed by some the ghosts of deified dead men, mere imaginary beings, and originated in the vain imaginations of the heathen. It is certain the Bible nowhere says that God created them, or gives us any account of their origin. Dr. Campbell says, "What the precise idea of demons, to whom possessions were ascribed, then was, it would be, perhaps, impossible for us with any certainty to affirm." This in one sense is true, for the Bible gives us no precise idea of demons as real beings. But if they were ideal beings, created by the imaginations of men, we may, perhaps, ascertain this to be a fact, which is sufficient on the subject. It is evident the New Testament writers speak of demons, and of persons being possessed with them, not as a new thing under the sun, but as a popular and common thing, and speak in the common language of the age about them. They speak of demons, the devil and satan, of the god Mammon, of transmigration, and other things, without saying how such opinions originated, or whether they were true or false. To have corrected all the false

opinions of the age would have been an arduous and vain work; and had they not spoken of things in the common language of other people, they could not have been understood, but would have subjected themselves to the charge of vanity and affectation. They did then, what we do now, speak in the popular language of the day. We speak of St. Anthony's fire, St. Vitus' dance, and of the rising and setting of the sun; and people would smile at the man who refused to do so.

The question with us now ought to be, How can we best arrive at true views about the demons of the New Testament? I answer, to examine, first, what the Old Testament teaches us about demons, evil spirits, etc. The Old and New Testaments were written principally by Jews, and among Jews; and he who would correctly understand the latter must make himself acquainted with the former. The Old Testament is the best dictionary to learn the language of the New. That person is ill prepared to understand the New Testament about demons, who has not consulted the Old respecting them, evil spirits, etc. And, in his examination of both, he ought to consider himself a Jew; living among them in past ages, and passing with them through all their changes; going with them into their captivities, and returning with them to their own land, with all the heathen notions they had imbibed. The shortest and surest way which we can take to arrive at the truth about the demons mentioned in the New Testament, is to examine the Old. The inquiry must be, did the Jews learn from their Scripture that demons were evil spirits or fallen angels? If they did not, the question will then arise, from what source did they derive the opinions about demons, and the possessions of them, which were entertained by them in the days of our Lord? Were they a new revelation from God? If not, were they invented among themselves? And if not, did they learn them from the heathen with whom they had intercourse? Until we have examined these questions, we are not pre-

pared to form correct views of demons and the possession of them in the New Testament. What, then, does the Old Testament teach us respecting them? What do the apocryphal books teach on this subject? And what do we learn from the heathen about demons, as given by writers respecting them? We adopt this course of investigation as the best we can devise, and shall pursue it as far as is practicable. I shall then examine,

1. The Old Testament. Dr. Campbell remarks, that "*diabolos* is always in the Hebrew, *tsar*, enemy, or *satan*, adversary; words never translated in the Septuagint *daimonion*. This word, on the contrary, is made to express some Hebrew term, signifying idol, pagan deity, apparition, or, what some render *satyr*." That demons are mentioned in the Old Testament, we shall now proceed to show. The first passage is,

Deut. 32: 17. "They sacrificed unto devils, not to God; to gods whom they knew not, to new gods, that came newly up, whom your fathers feared not." The Jews never sacrificed to *diabolos*, the devil. But they often sacrificed to demons, to idols, or strange gods. The names of those strange gods are often mentioned in the Old Testament. What those demons or false gods were we have noticed elsewhere; and we may observe, they always stand condemned in Scripture. And what the Jews sacrificed to them, we shall see immediately. But it will be asked, who or what were those demons to which they sacrificed? We shall see, afterward, that they were the ghosts of dead men deified, or imaginary beings, whom they raised to the honor of being gods.

The second text is Psal. 91: 6. Thou shalt not be afraid "for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction (*daimonion*) that wasteth at noonday." Some render it, "from accidents, and the demon at noonday." Some say it was "a maxim with Pythagoras, that heroes should be worshipped at noon." It is added, "In warm countries where people go to sleep

at noon, all disturbances were to be avoided; and evil spirits are there at that time of day as much talked of, as with us they are in dark nights, and perhaps for the same reason." But, as the original now stands, it affords no solid ground for any demon or evil spirit, nor does anything like this appear in our English version. The demon was some natural evil.

The third text is Psal. 96 : 5. "For all the gods of the nations are idols (*daimonia*), but the Lord made the heavens." Here it is expressly said, "All the gods of the heathen are demons." In the original it is, *alilim*, vanities, nothings. In other places they are called, "lying vanities." And God says, Isai. 45 : 5, "I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God beside me." But the words of Psal. 96 : 5, are also found in 1 Chron. 16 : 26, and there *alilim* is rendered *eidolon*, idols, and not *daimonia*. Levit. 19 : 4 is rendered in a similar way. And *alilim*, in Job 13 : 4, is rendered "of no value." But, if demons are evil spirits, how can it be said they are vanities, nothings, or of no value, if they both possessed men and tormented them? No; if this was true, they were something of a very important nature to the persons who suffered from them. But this passage ought to settle the question about demons in the New Testament, and especially as Paul declares the same thing, that an "idol or demon is nothing in the world." To suppose them real beings, evil spirits, is not only contrary to the Scriptures, but admits that they can work something very like miracles, in tormenting mankind. Some of the Jews thought that Beelzebub was the worker of the miracles in our Lord; which, if admitted, goes to invalidate all true miracles in proof of a divine revelation. If "all the gods of the nations were demons," I ask, were persons possessed with heathen gods?

The next text is Psal. 106 : 37. "Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils" (*daimoniois*). Here we are told that they "sacrificed their

sons and their daughters," and sacrificed them to demons, to idols, to false ideal gods, the names of which can be found in other places of the Old Testament. And, yet, it is believed by many that these imaginary beings did possess and torment men, from what is said in the New Testament. But the Jews could not have believed this, had the Old Testament been their guide, and had they not imbibed the heathen notions about demons. It is plain the ancient Jews had very different views about demons from their descendants in the days of our Lord, for they speak of them very differently.

The next text is Isa. 13: 21. "But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and satyrs (*daimonia*) shall dance there." The Hebrew word here is *soir*, which some say means hairy beings. But the whole verse is intended to describe the desolate condition of Babylon, that all kinds of wild birds and beasts should inhabit it. See also Isa. 34: 14, where *demonia* is also rendered satyr, but requires no further notice, for it is similar to the one just mentioned. If demons are fallen angels, it seems they are hairy beings, have their abodes with wild beasts at Babylon, and dance there. But who believes this; or who can believe such demons possessed men, and inflicted madness and other disorders upon them?

The next text is Isai. 65: 11. "But ye are they that forsake the Lord, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for that troop (*daimonio*), and that furnish the drink offering unto that number." *Gad* is put in the margin for "that troop" in the text, and for "that number" is put *Meni*. Jerome says, it is uncertain whether *Gad* or *Meni* was originally translated demon. Some have thought an allusion is here made to some Egyptian custom. And Dr. Spencer thought the most natural sense was, that they prepared a table to Gad, and a drink offering to Meni. But be this as it may, it is plain enough, the troop referred to was not a

troop of fallen angels, or evil spirits, but of heathen divinities, demons, or false gods, and agrees with other passages already noticed. It is well known, the demons or false gods of the heathen were numerous, and that they spread a table for them to eat and drink at. See on 1 Cor. 10: 19—22, below.

Lev. 17: 7, says, "And they shall no more offer their sacrifices unto devils, after whom they have gone a whoring." I might have passed over this text, for the word in the Septuagint is not *daimonia*. In the Hebrew the word for devils in this text is, *leshiodim*, which the Seventy render by the word *mataiois*, vain gods. Some think Pan is the god referred to; and according to Herodotus, statue-makers and painters "make the image of Pan with a she-goat's face, and a he-goat's legs; and that a goat and Pan were in the Egyptian language called *Mendes*." Be this as it may, there is no reference in this passage to wicked spirits or fallen angels, but to heathen gods, idols, mere nonentities or nothings in the world. If any one supposes the Jews sacrificed to devils, meaning fallen angels or wicked spirits, it is a great mistake. I shall show presently, from a high orthodox writer, that the Jews did not know about evil spirits until their captivity in Babylon. And the fact deserves notice that since that period the Jews have not been given to idolatry.

Having adduced all the texts in the Old Testament which speak of demons, what conclusions are we to draw from them? I answer, we cannot conclude that demons were fallen angels or wicked spirits, for not a hint of this is given in any one of them. But we may conclude, on the best of evidence, that demons were heathen gods, imaginary beings, who could not do good or evil. We may also safely conclude that the Jews, before they went to Babylon, had heard of and known something about demons, for they had sacrificed even their sons and daughters to them. And if Josephus may be credited, Solomon not only knew about demons, but had found out a root, the

smell of which expelled demons. But it was not until the Jews had gone to Babylon, that they learned that demons were evil spirits. But, having learned the heathen notions about demons, and forsaken their own Scriptures, they gradually made void God's law by these and their own traditions; so that demons, and the possession of demons, were as familiar to them, in Christ's day, as among the heathen around them. It is a great mistake to suppose that the possession of demons was unknown before and after the days of Jesus Christ and his apostles. In Christ's day, the possession of demons was no new thing, as has been repeatedly proved from heathen writers, as may appear in the sequel. Besides, the persons supposed to be possessed with demons labored under the same or similar disorders as those mentioned in the New Testament. All diseases, either of body or mind, were not imputed to demons. Christ cured Peter's wife's mother of a fever, and the person born blind; but these evils are not ascribed to the possession of demons. Epileptics, lunatics and madmen, in Christ's day, and long before it, were said to be possessed with demons; and wherever ignorance and superstition have prevailed, strange and unaccountable things are generally ascribed to supernatural beings. A great many people are fond of the marvellous; and among the ancient Jews things were ascribed to God which were done by men. The heathen ascribed all good things to their good gods, but evil things to evil spirits. But Job ascribed both to the true God. See Job 2 : 10.

Evil spirits. This phrase is used in the New Testament, and is synonymous with the word demons. And as the Old Testament is allowed to be the best commentary on the New, the phraseology, idioms, and modes of thought and speech being borrowed from it, some light will be shed on the subject before us. We begin by noticing the usage of the term spirit. Its peculiar usage may be seen at length by consulting a concordance on this word. For example, we read of "the spirit of prophecy," "the spirit of slumber," etc. Dr. Campbell

observes, "that it is a common idiom among the Jews to put spirit before any quality ascribed to a person, whether good or bad, mental or corporeal, thus the spirit of fear is used to express habitual fear," etc. It is easily perceived from this, that any bad thing might be turned into an evil spirit by connecting the word spirit with it. And this was the more easily done, if the term spirit was applied to imaginary beings, supposed to do men evil. They were personified, and spoken of as real beings, and were believed by many to have an actual existence, and could do them good or evil. Hence they offered sacrifices to them, to procure their favor or turn away their displeasure; for what is it which ignorance and superstition will not lead men to do in religion? But let us see what is said about,

"Evil spirits" in the Old Testament. This phrase in the plural is not found there, but the expression "evil spirit" in the singular occurs in the following places. In Judges 9: 23 it is said, "Then God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem; and the men of Shechem dealt treacherously with Abimelech." But I ask, did God send a fallen angel between Abimelech and the men of Shechem? No one I think affirms this, for "evil spirit" here does not mean a demon, a wicked being, but a spirit of opposition and hostility, as the context shows. In all the other places where the phrase "evil spirit" occurs, it refers to Saul. Thus it is said, 1 Sam. 16: 14, 15, 16, "But the spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him. And Saul's servants said unto him, Behold now, an evil spirit from God troubleth thee. Let our Lord now command thy servants, which are before thee, to seek out a man who is a cunning player on a harp: and it shall come to pass, when the evil spirit from God is upon thee, that he shall play with his hand, and thou shalt be well." In verses 17—23 we are told that David was sent for, and it is added, verse 23, "And it came to pass, when the evil spirit from God was upon Saul, that

David took an harp, and played with his hand: so Saul was refreshed and was well, and the evil spirit departed from him." But from chapter 18: 10, and 19: 9, we learn that this evil spirit returned upon Saul, and under its influence he attempted to kill David. But can any one suppose, God sent a fallen angel or wicked being on Saul, or, that he was a demoniac? What, then, was this evil spirit? The Chaldee paraphrast says, "Saul was mad, or acted as a madman in his house." Saul's disorder, at first, seems to have been only a melancholy madness, and it is likely the women's praises of David made him worse. "Saul has slain his thousands, and David his tens of thousands," roused him to jealousy and fury, and led him to seek David's death. See 1 Sam. 18: 7—12, and 19: 9—12. Saul's wrath was directed only against David. Had his "evil spirit" been a fallen angel or a wicked being, how could his servants suppose David's music could drive him away, as it did for a season? Are such beings charmed or frightened away by fine music? But if his disease was melancholy, it is well known that to this day good music tends to remove it. It is said by Theophrastus, "Music cures many disorders of mind and body: such as faintings, fears, and disorders of the mind. The playing upon the pipe cures the sciatica and epilepsy." And Martianus Capella says, "I have cured madness by symphony." Melancholy might be driven away, for a season at least, by good music, but how a fallen angel, a wicked spirit, could be removed by it, is not easily understood. Maimonides observes, "that the Jews call every sort of melancholy an evil spirit, and explains evil spirit by disease," which agrees with the usage of spirit, as shown above. It is said that Saul prophesied under his melancholy or madness. And some of the ancients supposed madmen could foretell future events. When the poets spoke of the heathen prophets, they represented them as mad, alienated in their minds. Virgil represents the sibyl as foaming and raging. And Lucian represents the priestess as

filled with fury, her hair standing on end, and she burning and foaming, and panting, whilst delivering her oracle. Some even looked on the prophets of the Lord as mad, and sometimes used music to excite prophetic influence. See 2 Kings 9 : 11, 12; Jer. 29 : 26. The above are all the texts where an evil spirit is mentioned in the Old Testament, and it is obvious a fallen angel or real being is not meant. But it is also evident that madness in Saul is called an evil spirit, and an evil spirit from the Lord. It is not said that he was possessed with it, that it was in him, but it is expressly said to have been upon him and to have troubled him, which we should think was about the same thing.

The case of Saul illustrates what is to be understood by demons, and the possession of them in the New Testament. There, a demon and an evil spirit evidently mean the same thing, for in the same passages the one expression is used in common for the other. Again, Saul's evil spirit was evidently insanity; and in the New Testament insane persons were said to be possessed with a demon, or evil spirit. Not all whom our Lord cured were said to be possessed with a demon, but only such as were more or less deranged in their minds. This fact we think is certain, and deserves attention from all who would correctly understand what is said in the New Testament about demons or evil spirits. It is also a fact, which is too much overlooked, that according to the person's degree of insanity was supposed to be the number of demons or evil spirits in him. Hence we read of persons possessed with a demon. But Mary Magdalene had seven demons in her, and one man declared he had a legion of them within him. But we shall see in the sequel that he was a wild, raving maniac. But, again, it is said that Saul's "evil spirit was from the Lord;" yet nothing like this is said of persons who were possessed with demons in the days of our Lord. But this difference is easily and rationally accounted for by a fact which I shall soon notice. The ancient Jews ascribed to God both the good and evil things which happened to them, as noticed in

the case of Job. After the Babylonish captivity, the Jews ascribed great and unaccountable evils, such as madness, to the influence of evil spirits. Before this period, they knew nothing about such spirits, for their Scriptures teach no such beings.

"*Unclean spirit.*" This phrase is only used once in the Old Testament, Zech. 13: 2. "And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord of hosts, that I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered; and also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land." If the day here mentioned refers to the gospel day, as some think it does, it predicts that, then, idols and the demons they represented were to be done away. Unclean spirit, and, in the plural, unclean spirits, are mentioned in the New Testament, Matt. 12: 43; Luke 11: 24; Mark 1: 23, 26; 3: 10; 5: 2, 8; Luke 8: 29; Mark 7: 25; Luke 9: 42; Matt. 10: 1; Mark 6: 7; 1: 27; Luke 4: 36; Mark 3: 11; 5: 13; Acts 5: 16; 8: 7; Rev. 16: 13. The phrase "foul spirit," occurs Mark 9: 35; Rev. 18: 2. But in the Greek it is the same, "unclean spirit," as in the above passages. The phrase in the New Testament was probably taken from this passage in the Old, and few will assert that it means here a fallen angel or wicked being. But what deserves special notice is, 1. That since the light of the gospel dispensation dawned on the world, demons, evil spirits, unclean spirits, idolatry, and other heathen superstitions, have begun to wax old and to vanish away. This light, when universally received, will banish such things from the earth. We have referred to all the texts where the phrase "unclean spirits" is found in the Bible. Let the reader consult them, and observe what can hardly escape his observation that demons are often called spirits in the New Testament. For example, see Matt. 8: 16. 2. Demons and "evil spirits" were considered the same, are used as synonymous expressions; for to cast out a demon was the same as to cast out an "evil spirit," and

the supposed power of the one was the same as that of the other. 3. A demon and an "unclean spirit" are also represented as the same, convertible expressions denoting the same thing. No one can doubt this who has read the New Testament, particularly the four gospels. For example, in Luke 4: 33, we are told of a man who "had a spirit of an unclean demon." 4. From comparing the passages relating to demons, "unclean spirits," and Beelzebub, all relate to the same thing, as could be shown. It has been alleged that Beelzebub is the same as *diabolos*, the devil or satan. But the popular belief then was that "he was the prince of the demons," and is the representation given in the New Testament concerning him, as we shall see hereafter.

Familiar spirits. The phrases, "familiar spirit," and "familiar spirits," occur in the following places in the Old Testament, which the reader can consult at his leisure. Levit. 20: 27, 28; 1 Chron. 10: 13; 2 Chron. 33: 6; Isai. 29: 4; Levit. 19: 31; 20: 6; Deut. 18: 11; 1 Sam. 28: 3, 9; 2 Kings 21: 6; 23: 24; Isai. 8: 19; 19: 3. But he ought to observe that neither of these phrases is used in the New Testament. One or two remarks are sufficient on the above passages. I shall merely name the following things which deserve the reader's notice. 1. Persons who pretended to have "a familiar spirit" were to be banished from among the Jews. 2. Persons who consulted with familiar spirits among the Jews were to be put to death. Saul and Manasseh did so, but their station in life saved them from death. 3. The persons who had a familiar spirit pretended to consult with and bring up the dead. Saul consulted with the woman at Endor that she might bring up Samuel to consult him in his distress. 4. Persons who had a familiar spirit were ventriloquists, and imposed on people, making their voice to sound as if it arose out of the ground, as we have shown in a former publication, and has been shown by others.

2. *The apocryphal books.* In these books demons

and evil spirits are mentioned, and require a brief notice. In Baruch 4: 7, it is said, "For ye provoked him that made you by sacrificing unto devils (*daimoniois*) and not to God." This text agrees with those already noticed in the Old Testament. The Jews often sacrificed to demons, or heathen gods, but never to *diabolos* the devil, or to devils. I may just notice here that the phrases "unclean spirits" and "familiar spirits" are not once mentioned in the apocryphal books. They were written after the captivity in Babylon; and on the return of the Jews from it, they were less given to idolatrous practices than before it, which may account for this.

All the other places, where demons, or evil spirits, are mentioned in the apocryphal books are Tobit, chapters 3: 8; 6: 17, and 8: 2. But every child has read the story concerning Asmodeus, the evil spirit, and how the smell of the heart and liver of a fish drove him to the uttermost parts of Egypt. The story is too absurd and childish to claim attention. It deserves notice, however, that the apocryphal writers seem to have believed in demons or evil spirits, while the inspired writers in the canonical books did not. This fact is of importance on the subject of demons, for it shows when and how the Jews imbibed such opinions as the following quotations admit.

Dr. Knapp, in his theology, vol. i. p. 448, thus writes, "There is no trace of a belief in the existence of evil spirits, even among the Jews, until the Babylonian captivity." Again, in p. 425, he says, "It is not until the time of the exile, or shortly after it, that we find distinct traces of the doctrine that there are angels who were once good, but who revolted from God, and are now become wicked themselves, and the authors of the evil in the world. The probability is, therefore, that this doctrine was first developed among the Jews during their residence in Chaldea and shortly afterwards." I might quote more to the same purpose, but I shall only add from pp. 465, 466. "The extravagant opinions which

formerly prevailed on this subject were the means of much injury, as appears from experience. They led the common people to what was, in effect, a belief in two gods — a good and an evil deity; and also to entertain false conceptions of the attributes of the true God, which could not have been without a practical influence on the life. They often furnish a real hindrance to moral improvement. For instance; in seeking for the origin of sin in themselves, and endeavoring to stop its sources, instead of becoming acquainted with, and avoiding the external occasions of sin, they laid the whole blame of it upon Satan, and when they had made him guilty, deemed themselves sufficiently justified and exculpated." Such are the remarks of an orthodox German divine, whose work was translated at Andover, and highly approved by the professors there. I never expected to see the day when my views should receive such confirmation from such a source. The reader ought to notice that Dr. Knapp does not pretend the Jews had the doctrine of evil spirits revealed to them by God at or during the Babylonian captivity. An important question then arises, How came they to learn this doctrine? This question we have answered in the first part of this work and in the First Inquiry, etc. It has been shown, from Dr. Campbell and other writers, that the Jews brought back from their captivity many opinions not found in their sacred books. Their minds were corrupted from their intercourse with the heathen, and when both Jews and heathen were converted to the faith of Christ, many false heathen notions were introduced into the Christian church, which are not all yet purged out. The Devil and other spirits are of this number, as Dr. Knapp admits. In the above investigation, the statements I have quoted from him, are strongly confirmed, for no one could find the doctrine of evil spirits in the Old Testament. Demons, evil spirits, familiar spirits, etc., all stand condemned there, and severe punishments were inflicted on the Jews who turned aside to such heathen worship and superstitions. What-

ever they knew about demons, evil spirits, etc., was not learned from their own Scriptures, but from the heathen around them. Many of their laws were given to maintain a separation of them from the Gentile nations. But after all those laws, and the punishments endured for the breach of them, they broke over this partition wall and learned the ways of their heathen neighbors. Much light would be shed on the subject of demons, and the possession of demons in the New Testament, if we had a full and perfect account of the heathen views on this subject, But, imperfect as this is, we shall not be able to use all the materials we have found suited to our purpose. We shall content ourselves with a few brief statements.

Enfield, in his Philosophy, says, pp. 33—36. "It appears, not only from the testimony of Diodorus, but from other ancient authorities collected by Eusebius, that the Chaldeans believed in God, the Lord and Parent of all, by whose providence the world is governed. And indeed, without this, it is impossible to conceive how their religious rites should ever have arisen; for the immediate object of these rites was a supposed race of spiritual beings or demons, whose existence could not have been imagined, without first conceiving the idea of a Supreme Being the source of all intelligence. Besides the Supreme Being, the Chaldeans supposed spiritual beings to exist, of several orders — gods, demons, heroes. These they probably divided into subordinate classes, as their practice of theology or magic required. The ancient eastern nations in general, and among the rest the Chaldeans, admitted the existence of certain evil spirits, clothed in habiliments of gross matter; and in subduing or counteracting these, they placed a great part of the efficacy of their religious incantations. The magic which the Chaldean Zoroaster invented was probably nothing more than the performance of certain religious ceremonies, by means of which good demons were supposed to be prevailed upon to communicate supernatural properties to herbs, stones, and other natural bodies, or to afford assist-

ance, in other miraculous ways, to those who invoked them. In war, it was supposed that by the help of magic the forces of an enemy might be routed, or an army struck with a general panic, as is said to have happened to Ninus in his war with the Bactrians. Notwithstanding the obscurity with which antiquity has covered the Chaldean philosophy, it has been highly extolled, not only by the Orientalists and Greeks, but by Jewish and Christian writers." Let it be remembered that the Jews spent seventy years in Babylon, and brought back from their captivity there many of the opinions of the people, as is universally admitted. Concerning the Celts, Enfield says, p. 94, "That they imagined the magnificent and gloomy scenes of nature to be inhabited by demons, fully appears from the Edda. Nor can any other reason be assigned for the superstitious notion which prevailed among them, than that these scenes were frequently the seat of oracular communications." On p. 81 he says, "The doctrine of an ethereal intelligence pervading and animating the material world, appears, among the Egyptians, to have been from the earliest time accompanied with a belief in inferior divinities. Conceiving emanations from the divinity to be resident in various parts of nature, when they saw life, motion, and enjoyment, communicated to the inhabitants of the earth from the sun, and, as they supposed, from other heavenly bodies, they ascribed these effects to the influence of certain divinities, derived from the first deity, which they supposed to inhabit these bodies. Hence arose their worship of the sun, under the name of Osiris, Amon, and Horus, etc. From the same source it may be easily conceived that, among the Egyptians as well as in other nations, would arise the worship of deified men, such as illustrious heroes, legislators, or improvers of human life by useful inventions and institutions. Hence they concluded that a large portion of that divinity which animates all things resided in them, and supposed that, after death, the good demon that animated them passed into the society of the divinities.

Enfield informs us, p. 256, that Xenocrates taught, "The heavens are divine, and the stars celestial gods; and that besides these divinities, there are terrestrial demons of a middle order between the gods and men, which partake of the nature both of the mind and body, and are, therefore, like human beings, capable of passions and liable to diversity of character. Like Plato, he probably thought the inferior gods, or demons, to be derived from the soul of the world, and, like that principle, to be compounded of a simple and divisible substance." On page 356, he says, "Demons were divided into superior and inferior; the superior, those which inhabited the sun and stars, which they considered as animated substances; the inferior, human souls separated from the body, or heroes. Illustrious men, says Cicero, whose souls survive and enjoy immortality, are justly esteemed to be gods, since they are of an excellent and immortal nature." And, p. 420, we are told, "Subordinate to the deity, it was taught in the Italic school, that there are three orders of intelligences, gods, demons, heroes, who are distinguished by their respective degrees of excellence and dignity, and by the nature of the homage which is due to them; gods being to be preferred in honor of demi-gods or demons, and demons to heroes or men. These three orders, in the Pythagorean system, were emanations at different degrees of proximity from the supreme intelligence, the particles of subtle ether assuming a grosser clothing the further they receded from the fountain. The third order, or heroes, were supposed to be invested with a subtle material clothing. If to these three species we add a fourth, the human mind, we have the whole scale of divine emanation, as it was conceived by this sect of philosophers." Other heathen philosophers might be quoted, who held similar opinions, and will be referred to in the course of our investigation. It is evident from these statements that the heathen had abundance of demons and various kinds of them.

In the preceding remarks, we have said but little as to the meaning given the words *daimon* and *daimonion*,

but shall now introduce what orthodox lexicographers and others say concerning them.

1. *Daimon.* Parkhurst says it means, "1. A demon, an intelligence. Its senses in the heathen writers may be seen under *daimonion* first and second, besides which, it sometimes signifies fortune, sometimes an attendant genius." He says, "2. In the New Testament it is used only for an evil spirit, a fallen angel." But so far from producing proof of this, he adds, to the contrary, "the Seventy's version of Isai. 13: 21, where the Hebrew *shorim*, rough, hairy creatures, is rendered by *daimonia*, demons, agreeably to the heathen notions, that their demons, such as Pan, the Fawns, Satyrs, etc., appeared in the shape of rough, shaggy animals." Parkhurst here confirms what we have said on some texts in the Old Testament. He says, "Rev. 18: 2, seems an allusion to the Seventy's version of Isai. 13: 21," and shows the New Testament writers used *daimon* in the Old Testament sense of *daimonia*, which in no instance refers to fallen angels. It would be strange, indeed, if the New Testament writers differed so much from the Old as to make demons fallen angels, yet give us no account of so great an alteration, for we have seen the Jews knew nothing about evil spirits until the Babylonian captivity. When, pray, were demons converted into evil spirits? But let us hear him on

2. *Daimonion.* Parkhurst says, it signifies, "1. A deity, a god, or more accurately some power or supposed intelligence in that grand object of heathen idolatry, the material heavens or air. Thus, the word is generally applied by the Seventy, who use it, Isai. 65: 11, for god, the destructive troop or powers of the heavens, in thunder, lightning, storm, etc. In Deut. 35: 17; Psal. 105: 35, for *sedim*, the pourers forth, or genial powers of nature; and as by *daimoniou mesemnou*, the mid-day. demon, Psal. 91: 6, we may be certain they intended not a devil but a pernicious blast of air. (Comp. Isa. 28: 2, in the Hebrew.) So from this and the fore-cited passages, we

can be at no loss to know what they meant, when in their translation of Psal. 96: 5, they say all the gods of the Gentiles are *daimona*, that is, not devils, but some powers or imaginary intelligences of material nature. But it must be observed, that according to the highly probable opinion of that learned Jew, Maimonides, the error of the first idolaters consisted in their maintaining that, as the stars and planets, to which I think we should add the circulating fluid of the heavens, were created by God to govern the world, so it was his pleasure that they should be honored and worshipped as his ministers; and that, accordingly, men proceeded to adore them, in order to procure the good will of Him who created them, thus making them mediators between men and God; and this, says he, was the foundation of idolatry, which assertion is amply confirmed by the plain traces of this doctrine being found among the heathen, even down to the time of Christ and his apostles, and, indeed, long after. Most express are the words of Plato: 'Every demon is a middle being between God and mortal man.' If you ask what he means by a middle being, he will tell you, God is not approached immediately by man, but all the commerce and intercourse between gods and men is performed by the mediation of demons. Would you see the particulars? Demons are reporters and carriers from men to the gods, and again from the gods to men, of the supplications and prayers of the one, and of the injunctions and rewards of devotion from the other. The philosopher Plutarch, who flourished at the beginning, and of Apuleius, who lived after the middle of the second century, teach the same doctrine. And this, says the learned Mede, was the ecumenical philosophy of the apostles' times and of the times long before them. Thales and Pythagoras, all the academics and Stoics, and not many to be excepted unless the Epicures, taught this divinity. Now when Paul affirms, 1 Cor. 19: 20, that what the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to *daimonios*, not to God, we may understand *daimonia* to mean either

some powers or supposed intelligences of material nature in general, or, in a more confined sense, according to the common opinion of the Gentiles in his time, such powers or intelligences, considered as mediators between the supreme God and mortal men. 'For this,' says Mr. Mede, 'was then the very tenet of the Gentiles, that the sovereign and celestial gods were to be worshipped only with the pure mind, and with hymns and praises; and that sacrifices were only for demons.' I will not, however, take upon me positively to affirm that Paul had in view this latter tenet of heathenism in the above passage. It is sufficient to prove his assertion, that the general objects to which the Gentile sacrifices were offered, were nothing higher than some powers of material nature, or some other intelligences supposed to reside therein; than this, nothing can be more certain, from all accounts, sacred and profane. And thus *daimonion* is used, 1 Cor. 10: 20, 21.

"2. Besides these original *daimonia*, those material mediators, or the intelligences residing in them, whom Apuleius calls a higher kind of demons, who were always free from the incumbrances of the body, and out of which higher order, Plato supposes guardians were appointed unto men, — besides these, the heathen acknowledged another sort, namely, the souls of men deified or canonized after death. So, Hesiod, one of the most ancient heathen writers, describing that happy race of men who lived in the first and golden age of the world, saith, that 'after this generation were dead, they were, by the will of great Jupiter, promoted to be demons, keepers of mortal men, observers of their good and evil works, clothed in air, always walking about the earth, givers of riches; and this, saith he, is the royal honor that they enjoy.' Plato concurs with Hesiod, and asserts that 'he and many other poets speak excellently, who affirm that when good men die, they obtain great honor and dignity and become demons.' The same Plato, in another place, maintains that 'all those who die valiantly in war are of Hesiod's

golden generation, and are made demons, and that we ought forever after to serve and adore their sepulchres as the sepulchres of demons. The same also, says he, we decree whenever any of those who were excellently good in life die, either of old age or in any other manner.' And according to this notion of *daimonion*, the word appears to be applied in several passages of the New Testament. Thus, Acts 17: 18, some of the Athenians said of Paul, he seemeth to be a proclaimer of strange demons—gods, because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection. In the similar sense of demon-gods or souls of dead men, deified or canonized, the word is used Rev. 9: 20, and in the expression, doctrines concerning demons, 1 Tim. 4: 1; as, doctrines concerning baptisms, Heb. 6: 2; the doctrine concerning the Lord, Acts 13: 12. For proof, I refer to Mr. Mede and Bishop Newton; and, to what they have adduced on this subject, shall only add that Ignatius, who, according to Chrysostom, had conversed familiarly with the apostles, plainly uses *daimonion* for a human spirit or ghost, and the adjective *daimonikos* for "one disembodied and in the state of spirits." But Parkhurst says, *daimonion* means "3d, and most generally, an evil spirit, a devil, one of those angels who kept not their first estate, and are called by the collective name, satan, and *diabolos*, the devil." But all the proof he gives of this is a reference to some texts without note or comment upon them, and to the book of Tobit. Here he spoke from his prejudice in favor of the popular opinions; for not in a single instance is *diobolos* called a demon in the Bible, or a demon *diabolos;* nor are the two names confounded, as if they meant the same thing. And where is it intimated that a demon was a fallen angel? What he has said above is at variance with such a sentiment. Had he found a single text, from which he could have proved that a demon was an evil spirit, satan, *diabolos*, or the devil, no doubt he would have done it. But

3. On the word *daimonizomai*, he says, it means "to

be possessed by a demon. It is the same as, *daimon chein*, to have a demon or devil, John 7: 20. Those who were possessed with prophesying demons, Acts 16: 16, were called by the Greeks, *daimenoleptoi*. See Archbishop Potter's Antiquities of Greece. In the New Testament, the word *daimoniodes* occurs only once, namely, in James 3: 15, and is rendered in our common version, devilish." Parkhurst makes no remarks on it, nor does it require any particular notice.

Such is Parkhurst's account of demons; and it is obvious how much it agrees with what is said in the Old Testament about demons. How he reconciled this account with his bare statement that demons were fallen angels, I know not, for he does not attempt it, and I feel assured that it never can be done. The passages he refers to in the New Testament are, Matt. 8: 31; Mark 5: 12; Luke 8: 29; Rev. 16: 14. They will be considered in the sequel. In passing, we shall only say, such texts can never prove demons to be fallen angels in opposition to all we have said to the contrary, and what we have said is in substance what others have said before us.

We come now to an examination of the New Testament respecting demons and of persons being possessed with them. But we ought to come to it in full view of the light given us on the subject from the Old Testament, the Apocryphal books, and the writers quoted. Nor, should the indisputable fact be forgotten, which is stated by Dr. Knapp, that evil spirits were not known among the Jews until the Babylonian captivity. It is certain, as we have seen, that the Jews knew about demons long before this period, for they sacrificed their sons and daughters to them. Who then converted them into evil spirits, and instructed them, that they could possess men's bodies and inflict disorders upon them? How, and by whom, was this great change in demons effected? No change was effected in them; the change was in the Jews, in adopting the popular opinions which

then prevailed. And I shall show this from facts which cannot be disputed.

1. It is a fact that demons are never spoken of as evil spirits in the New Testament, except in connection with disorders which popular heathen notions had ascribed to them. All diseases were not imputed to demons or evil spirits, as is obvious from the four gospels, but such as were strange, difficult to account for, incurable or very hard to cure: such as madness, epilepsy, etc. This we shall see, and is a fact which few will dispute.

2. It is also a fact that the New Testament writers never intimate that demons in their day were to be understood differently from what they were in the days of Moses and the prophets; that anciently they were heathen gods, imaginary beings, but now had become evil spirits to inflict disorders on men. They indeed speak of persons under certain disorders as being possessed with demons, but, aside from such cases, they never assert demons to be real beings, of any kind, that could injure any person either in body or mind. On the contrary, it is,

3. An indisputable fact that when they speak of demons aside from diseased persons, they speak of them as the writers of the Old Testament did before them. As these facts are of importance, in examining into the New Testament respecting demons, I shall first introduce the texts which prove the last fact. When this is done, much is accomplished towards showing that demons in the New Testament were not evil spirits or fallen angels any more than in the Old. The passages I quote are the following:

1 Cor. 10: 20, 21. "But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with demons. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of demons." The Gentiles did not sacrifice either to the true God or *diabolos*, the Devil.

Macknight says, "They sacrificed to demons. The word *daimonia*, demons, is used in the Seventy to denote the ghosts of men deceased; and Josephus, Bell. lib. 7, c. 6, says demons are the spirits of wicked men. It is therefore probable that the writers of the New Testament used the word demon in the same sense, especially as it is well known that the greatest part of the heathen gods were dead men. The heathen worshipped two kinds of demons, the one kind were the souls of kings and heroes deified after death, but who could have no agency in human affairs. The other kind of demons were those evil spirits, who, under the names of Jupiter, Apollo, Trophonius, etc., moving the heathen priests and priestesses to deliver oracles, greatly promoted idolatry. The heathen, in general, had no idea of God; that is, of an unoriginated, eternal, immutable, and infinitely perfect being, the creator and governor of all things. In the heathen sacrifices, the priests, before they poured the wine upon the victim, tasted it themselves; then carried it to the offerers, and to those who came with them, that they also might taste it, as joining in the sacrifice, and receiving benefits from it—of the table of demons; that is, of the sacrifice offered to demons, which was eaten on a table in the demon's temple." I add from Dr. Campbell, who says, "Now in regard to idols, the apostle had said in the same epistle, 1 Cor. 8: 4, that an idol is nothing in the world; in other words is the representation of an imaginary being. It is as much as to say, Jupiter and Juno, and Saturn, and all the rest of the heathen gods, as delineated by the poets and mythologists, are nonentities, the mere creatures of imagination." He adds, "besides, a great part of the heathen worship was confessedly paid to the ghosts of departed heroes, of conquerors, and potentates, and of the inventors of arts, whom popular superstition, after disguising their history with fables and absurdities, blindly deified. Now, to all such beings, they themselves, as well as the Jews, assigned the name *demonia*." I ask, can anything be

more clear and conclusive, than that demons in Paul's day were the same as those mentioned in the Old Testament? But if any one should assert that they are different, we call for proof.

Acts 17: 18. "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods; because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection." This, I believe, is the only place in the New Testament where *daimonia* is rendered gods. The Athenians supposed that Paul preached Jesus as one god, and the resurrection as another, and deemed them as new and strange gods at Athens. Had the translators of our English version given the rendering here as they have done in other places, they would have made the Athenians say, Paul was a "setter forth of strange devils." I wish they had done so, for it would have led people to inquire if the term devils was a correct rendering in other passages where *daimonia* occurs. The word *daimonia* in this text is used in a good sense, being applied to the souls of men deified or canonized after death at Athens. This remark applies also to other texts which we need not quote. But whether the Athenians deemed their gods or demons good or bad, Paul did not admit them to be beings of any kind whatever. On the contrary, his spirit was stirred within him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." The next three texts I shall quote together, as they are very similar, and like the preceding show the demons of the New Testament to be the same as of the Old.

Rev. 9: 20. "And the rest of the men which were not killed by those plagues, yet repented not of the work of their hands, that they should not worship demons and idols of gold," etc. Rev. 16: 14. "For they are the spirits of demons, working miracles," etc. And, 18: 2. "Babylon the great is fallen, and is become the habitation of demons," etc. Neither heathens nor Christians worshipped *diaboloi*, devils, that I can find. And who can believe that demons, the imaginary gods of the heathen, could work miracles? And did Babylon become "the

habitation" of either devils or demons? But all must perceive the similarity of the statements in these texts to some of the passages in the Old Testament which have been considered. It seems Babylon has been famous as a habitation of demons both in ancient and modern times, and demons also famous for working miracles. The demons worshipped by Jews and heathens, so far from being gods, evil spirits, or fallen angels, were lying vanities, and could not save them that trusted in them.

1 Tim. 4: 1. "Giving heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines concerning demons." This is Macknight's version, and in a note he says, "The word translated demons was used by the Greeks to denote a kind of beings of a middle nature between God and man. See on 1 Cor. 10: 20, 21. They gave the name, also, to the souls of some departed men, who, they thought, were exalted to the state and honor of demons for their virtue. See Newton on the Prophecies, vol. ii. p. 418. The former sort they called superior demons, and supposed them to have the nature and office which we ascribe to angels. The latter they termed inferior demons. They were of the same character with the Romish saints, and both sorts were worshipped as mediators. When, therefore, the spirit of God foretold, in an audible manner, that in after times many would give heed to deceiving spirits, and to doctrines concerning demons, he foretold that on the authority of feigned revelation many in the church would receive the doctrine concerning the worship of angels and saints, and praying of souls out of purgatory; and called it the doctrine of demons, because it was in reality the same with the ancient heathenish worship of demons, as mediators between the gods and men." The souls of men, canonized after death, are modern demons, mediators between God and men, and like the ancient demons have been supposed to heal men and inflict disorders upon them, as they felt disposed. Christians, in modern times, are not free from the worship of demons. Wherein lies the great difference of paying devotion to the ghost

of a dead canonized saint, and an ancient deified hero? And is it not as easy to pray souls out of purgatory as to reform them in hell? If Christians made themselves better acquainted with their Bible, and also with ancient heathen opinions, they would see that it is the heathen notions, which have been blended with Christianity, that have produced the endless divisions among them. They would see that some of their darling dogmas were derived from the heathen, and are even expressed in heathen phraseology. The doctrine of demons or evil spirits is but a small part of what Christians have borrowed from the heathen, as I have attempted to show in this work and in other publications.

We have seen, elsewhere, that to have a demon, and be possessed with a demon, mean the same thing. Thus, the Jews said of Christ, John 10: 20, 21, "He hath a demon and is mad, why hear ye him? Others said, These are not the words of him that hath a demon; can a demon open the eyes of the blind?" On this passage the improved version says, "Observe, those words express cause and effect; the disease is insanity, the supposed cause is possession by a demon or human ghost, than which no supposition can be more absurd; but it was the philosophy of the age." See, also, John 7: 20, and 8: 40—53, where similar charges are brought against the Saviour, which I need not quote. If to have a demon and be mad express cause and effect, as seems to be true, our Lord's own relations stated the effect without naming the supposed cause, for they said concerning him, "He is beside himself." They probably said this because his teachings and actions were so different from that of others, and so contrary to their wishes.

Matt. 11: 18, says, concerning John the Baptist, for John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say he hath a demon. It is repeated, Luke 7: 33. Dr. Lightfoot observes that it was customary for the Jews to attribute to evil spirits certain great disorders which either distorted the body, or occasioned phrensy or distraction

of the mind. It seems that John, like the Saviour, was deemed deranged in his mind; and his appearance and manner of life, perhaps, led people to draw this conclusion. His raiment was of camel's hair, he had a girdle of leather about his loins, his meat was locusts and wild honey, and he frequented the wilderness to which melancholy or mad people resorted. Josephus says that demoniacs were possessed by the spirits of bad men, and such seem to have been the demons the Jews ascribed to John and Jesus. It is said the demons mentioned in Scripture were all understood in a bad sense by the fathers of the church. But to this, we think, there are some exceptions, as could be shown if it were necessary. It could also be shown that the charge against John and Jesus, that they had a demon, was not general; for we are told "Others said these are not the words of him that hath a demon; can a demon open the eyes of the blind?" The common sense of people told them that the charge was false against the Saviour. But, there was something so unaccountable about both, so different from other persons, that, according to the popular opinions of the age, it was supposed they were possessed with a demon.

But the following statements deserve particular notice, for they have a direct bearing on the possession of demons mentioned in the New Testament. "The region of the air was supposed by the Pythagoreans to be full of spirits, demons, or heroes, who cause sickness or health to man or beast, and communicate at their pleasure, by means of dreams and other instruments, of divination, the knowledge of future events. That Pythagoras himself held this opinion cannot be doubted, if it be true, as his biographers relate, that he professed to cure diseases by incantations. It is probable that he derived it from the Egyptians, among whom it was believed that many diseases were caused by demoniacal possessions." Enfield, p. 421. Tertullian says, "Demons inflict upon men's bodies diseases, and are the peculiar authors of some sorts of very grievous mischances; but

as to the soul, they are the authors of men's going suddenly and extraordinarily beside themselves. The subtilty and fineness of their make enables them to enter into both the body and soul of men." But how could he know all this? Who ever saw a demon? and what scripture writer describes "the fineness of their make?" Tertullian and many others have believed demons to be evil spirits; but this opinion was derived from the heathen and not divine revelation, and their notions about them were mere suppositions. Who told them demons inflicted diseases on men?

It was supposed that several disorders were produced by the heathen deities; but this idea was groundless, as Paul declares they were "nothing in the world." And if they had been real beings, as many have supposed, who has ever proved, or can prove, that they produced such disorders? What sacred writer has said they did? The epilepsy was imputed to Apollo; but who can prove that he was its cause, or had any power over men? The Romans, as well as the Greeks, imputed certain disorders to demons or evil spirits; but no one now believes the disorders of the Cerviti or Larvati were produced by Ceres, the mother of the gods or spectres; and that some persons had a legion of spectres in them. All this was mere hypothesis, the philosophy of those times. We even doubt if the people had a serious belief in their own hypothesis. If they had, why did they prescribe, as a cure of disorders produced by demons, "radish and hellebore prepared in a certain way, the water of a smith's forge, the tongue, eyes, gall, and intestines of a dragon, the blood of a mole, diamonds, amber, etc.; or, how could they believe that the drinking the juice of a certain herb called Thalassegle, could cause men to be possessed with demons?" See Pliny's Natural History. They must have been strange demons, indeed, if such things expelled them. Hippocrates and others, among the ancients, have shown that epilepsy, melancholy, and madness, which were ascribed to demons, are accounted for from natural

causes. The man would be deemed mad, now, who would impute such disorders to demons or evil spirits. We, indeed, speak of St. Vitus' dance and St. Anthony's fire, but no one believes those saints produced these disorders. Ceres, Apollo, Mars, Neptune, or any demon, had just as little hand in producing the disorders imputed to them.

It is evident that among the Jews demons were expelled by natural means. See how Tobit's evil spirit was expelled, as noticed in another place. They were expelled, also, by music and strong smells, and it is related in Josephus' history that Solomon found out a root called Baaras, which was put under the seal of a ring, and when held to the nose, drew the demon out at this passage. He relates a story of Eleazer casting out demons in the presence of Vespasian and others; and, to convince them of the fact, commanded the demon to overturn a vessel of water as he went out. But the story is too long for quotation, and too absurd to deserve notice.

I come now to consider all the passages in the New Testament which speak of casting out demons, whether by Christ or others. We begin with the general statements respecting this, and, as they are similar, the same remarks apply to them all.

Matt. 4: 24. "And Jesus' fame went throughout all Syria; and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments; and those which were possessed with demons, and those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them." Comp. Matt. 9: 35. Wakefield's note here deserves the reader's notice. He says, "Demoniacs, a popular name for one sort of madness, chiefly of the raging kind, founded on a foolish superstition of the vulgar that madmen were possessed by the spirits of dead men, called demons, just as others were called lunatics, as if affected by the moon. So modern times have had their St. Vitus' dance and St. Anthony's fire; and these terms are used without scruple by those who have not the least notion of the interference of these saints in these particular disorders.

Indeed, all great irregularities in the system of nature, of which raging madness is one, the ancients, both heathen and Jews, but especially the latter, were accustomed to attribute to supernatural agency. See my Evidences of Christianity, p. 14, 2d Edit. Thus, for instance, an unusual and lucky cast of the dice was called by the Romans the cast of Venus, as if occasioned by that goddess. It is wonderful to me how any man, conversant with classic authors, can entertain any other opinion of the demoniacs of the New Testament. Indeed, it is the most remarkable instance I know of the triumph of prejudice and superstition over learning and good sense. This, however, is not the place to enter more minutely into this question; and I shall only mention that this idea is nothing new. The same opinion was maintained by several great men, both of the last and present century; and, among the rest, by Joseph Mede, of Christ's College, Cambridge, as learned, and, in every view, as respectable a divine as England ever produced." This quotation confirms many things said above, and applies to several passages which we shall presently consider. It deserves our notice, that, in the above passage, the common expression, "and he healed them," is applied to all, whatever their disorders were, and intimates that those supposed to be possessed with demons were diseased as well as the others. But we shall see from other passages that this mode of speaking is not always observed, and, perhaps for this reason, that the bodily diseases of insane persons are not always apparent; hence the demon or madness is said to be cast out, because this was visible to others.

Matt. 8: 16. "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with demons; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick." The parallel or similar passages may be found in Mark 1: 32, 34, 39; Luke 4: 40, 41. On the whole of them I will merely suggest a few hints. It is very evident that in these texts demons and spirits

express the same thing. It is also evident that those possessed with demons are distinguished from such as were sick with divers diseases. Again, the demons are represented as crying out "Thou art Christ, the Son of God." But it will be seen, from other passages, that it was the persons, not the demons, who did this, and it was the persons he rebuked, and suffered them not to speak. According to the popular opinions, the demons were supposed to speak in or through the persons possessed, just as madness now speaks in or through a maniac. Jesus rebuked a fever, and why not also madness, or any other diseases? See Luke 4: 39. Jesus, Luke 13: 22, desired them to go and tell Herod that he cast out demons. But did he mean, by this, that he cast out fallen angels? We should think not, but that he cast out madness, cured insane people; a disease which now, as then, was often incurable.

In Luke 8: 2, 3, and Mark 16: 9, we are told Jesus cast seven demons out of Mary Magdalene; and we shall see that a person declared that he had a legion of demons within him. I would suggest it for consideration here, whether the number of demons supposed to be in a person was not determined by the degree of the insanity he manifested. I find no insane person mentioned in the New Testament who was not deemed a demoniac.

In the following texts, we are told that Jesus gave his disciples power and authority to cast out demons, Matt. 10: 8; Mark 3: 15; Luke 9: 1, and 10: 17. Also Mark 16: 17. But, did he give them power to cast out of persons fallen angels; or, even the ghosts of dead men deified? If so, then this was done by others besides them, as appears from Mark 9: 38; Luke 9: 49; Matt. 7: 22, 23. Besides, it has been shown, that persons cast out demons, or fallen angels, by natural means; and people are sent to our insane hospitals, and put into the hands of physicians every day, to have fallen angels cast out of them. By what symptoms, or, by what rule was it determined that demons produced

such insanity, and other disorders, in ancient times, yet no demons produce such disorders now? Have hospitals and physicians banished them from the earth?

We come now to the examination of the passages which are supposed to teach that demons are wicked spirits, and were the cause of various disorders among men in the days of our Lord. We request the reader to bear in mind what has been said in the preceding pages. And, before we proceed, it may be of use to make the following remarks: —

1. Of the persons cured by Christ, only a few were possessed by demons compared with those whom he healed of various other diseases. Perhaps they bore the same proportion that deranged people do now to all the sick in the community. I do not mention this as a certain proof that they were deranged people; but if it is proved that they were, this circumstance goes to confirm it. It is certain those possessed with demons were deemed among the diseased he cured, for it is said of them, in common with the rest, that "he healed them," that "they were made whole." Insanity and other great disorders were not known then, as now, to arise from natural causes, hence were ascribed to evil spirits, or demons. Who now imputes to persons in our insane hospitals, that they are possessed with demons, or that the wildest maniac has a legion of them in him?

2. As those who were possessed with demons are distinguished from all other sick and diseased whom our Lord healed, the question arises, In what way were they distinguished from all the others? By what symptom did people judge that any person was possessed with a demon? From malice or prejudice, persons might be accused with having a demon without any just ground for it, as was the case with Jesus and John Baptist. But in the case about to be introduced, nothing of this kind can be admitted. People must have judged by their bodily senses, when they concluded that a person was possessed of a demon; and certain visible symptoms

in the person's appearance, words, and actions, formed the ground of this conclusion. Our bodily senses are not fitted to see spirits at all, much less to see them within a person, and still less to determine whether he had one, seven, or a legion of demons within him. It is not pretended any one knew all this by a divine revelation in the Old or New Testament; for we have seen that demons are spoken of in both as false gods, vanities, or nothings in the world. No scripture writer says they are fallen angels, or evil beings of any kind. God is not said to have created them. They are not said to be the ghosts of dead men, either good or bad, in the Bible; for this is an old heathen superstition. It has waxed old, and like witches has vanished away; but some still suppose they find it in their Bibles.

What, then, were the external symptoms which indicated that persons were possessed with demons? Were they bodily, or mental, or both? In some cases mental, in some both. The bodily symptoms of a fever, or the palsy, etc., were no proofs that a person was possessed with a demon. It was mental aberration in a greater or less degree, or some strange disease, which designated persons to be possessed with demons, and the number of demons in them was estimated according to the degree of their derangement. The demon or demons were supposed to enter the persons when they became deranged, and to leave them when restored to a sound mind. It is said by Hammond that "the Jews considered the leprosy as inflicted by God; and the Persians, as inflicted by the sun for offending him." And Lightfoot says, "The Jews attributed some of the more grievous diseases to evil spirits." And the woman's disorder, mentioned Luke 13, is ascribed to Satan, because she could not stand upright. But, in the New Testament, all the persons said to be possessed with demons seem to have been deranged, or to have had some unusual disease of the body. Common bodily diseases are never as-

cribed to demons. But let us come to the passages which speak of persons possessed with demons.

Matt. 9: 32—35; Luke 11: 14—27. Let the reader compare and notice what Matthew says: "They brought to Jesus a dumb man possessed with a demon." But Luke seems to say the demon was dumb. He "was casting out a demon, and it was dumb." But was a fallen angel, an evil spirit, dumb? No, the man was dumb; for it is said "When the demon was gone out, the dumb spake." If the demon was dumb while in the man, it was the man who made him dumb; for as soon as cast out, he became a speaking demon, and our Lord, of course, cursed the demon rather than the man. But this is too absurd to be believed. It is not said, this man was born dumb; his dumbness is imputed to the demon, whatever that was. From what has been said in the preceding pages, derangement seems to have been the demon. And this agrees to cases of a similar nature in our own day. Some persons' derangements make them dumb, like this person; you cannot make them speak on any subject. They are sullen and silent at all times. But this person's loss of speech, from some unaccountable cause, was sufficient, in the language of the times, to have it ascribed to a demon. But when the cause of any disease is inscrutable to mortals, is it proper to ascribe it to demons, a race of heathen imaginary beings? Why not, like Job, ascribe it to God?

Matt. 12: 22—31. In chapter 9: 22, we have seen that they brought to Jesus "a dumb man possessed with a demon." But in this passage we are informed there was brought to him "one possessed with a demon, blind and dumb." But surely it was the person, and not the demon, that was blind and dumb. Further we are told, that Jesus "healed him;" not surely the demon, but the man. And it is added, "insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw." It is not said, Jesus cast the demon out of this man, but that "he healed him," which shows that the demon was the disease which caused

his dumbness and want of sight. It is not said of this person, as of one, John 9th, that he was born blind. This person's blindness and dumbness seem to have been produced by disease, and we have seen above that the Jews imputed great disorders both of body and mind to demons. The Pharisees, on this occasion, as on several others, said, "This fellow doth not cast out demons, but by Beelzebub, the prince of demons." This shows that even they deemed the healing the persons of such a disorder the same as casting out the demon. Concerning Beelzebub, and our Lord's reasoning with the Pharisees on their charge against him, we shall here notice, once for all; it applies to other passages. We are told that on this occasion the Pharisees said, "He casteth out demons through the prince of the demons." Beelzebub is repeatedly called the prince of the demons, but never the prince of the devils, and is one instance out of many where our English word, devils, leads people wrong, being the rendering of both *diabolos* and *daimonion* in our English version of the New Testament. But it is evident, from 2 Kings 1: 2, that Beelzebub was the god of Ekron, the fly-hunting god as some affirm, because he preserved his worshippers from these insects, so annoying in hot climates, and was worshipped under the form of a fly. It is said the Jews called every demon Satan and Samael, the prince of Satans. See Doddridge on Matt. 12. But satan, as we have seen in the first part of this work, simply means an adversary. By consulting the passage, it is seen our Lord goes on to reason with the Pharisees, showing them the inconsistency of supposing that one demon would cast out another, or that the prince of the demons would cast out his own subjects. In other passages he shows its inconsistency by a house and kingdom being divided against themselves.

Matt. 17: 14—22; Mark 9: 14—30; Luke 9: 37—43. The case stated in these passages was that of an only son, and had been under the disorder from a child. Celsus and Hippocrates say it was epilepsy, and the

latter says, "when the disorder is of long standing, it is incurable." The symptoms described in the passages agree to this. Matthew says he was lunatic; and epilepsy, as is well known, often deranges the mind. His epileptic fits were the same as those in the present day, under this disease. It is evident, a demon, a spirit, and a deaf and dumb spirit, mentioned, all designate the same thing, and the effects produced are ascribed to it. But what need was there for an evil spirit to produce them, any more than in the present day? The disease was sufficient then as now to produce the effects. The disease was the demon, the dumb, deaf, and foul spirit, and nothing else was needed. It produced lunacy of mind and distress of the body, as now, and rationally accounts for all the distressing effects mentioned. The common usage of the term spirit in Scripture, and as used in the case of Saul and others, ought here to be remembered. When Jesus cured this child, it is said he "rebuked" the demon, the unclean spirit, etc., and healed the child. But Jesus is said to have rebuked "a fever" and the winds and waves of the sea, etc. Perhaps the difficulty of curing this disorder led our Lord to say, prayer and fasting were necessary to cure it.

Mark 1: 23—29; Luke 4: 33—36. In these passages "an unclean spirit," and a "spirit of an unclean demon," mean the same thing. What was this? It was that which "tore the man and threw him in the midst." But from these very expressions, brief as they are, it may be concluded that this man's disorder was similar to the child's under the epilepsy already noticed. And, that it had deranged his mind we may also infer, for he supposed himself possessed of more than one demon or evil spirit, for he said, "Let US alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? Art thou come to destroy US? I know thee who thou art, the holy one of God." This man's derangement was not a deaf and dumb spirit, like that of the epileptic child, for he was rather talkative; and it proves nothing against his de-

rangement that he spoke what he did; for deranged persons often speak truth, and more of it than some wish to hear. When Jesus cured the man, he rebuked him, commanded him to be silent. But had he rebuked the demon or the unclean spirit, it would have been only rebuking the man's disease, as he did the fever in Peter's wife's mother. When a person is seized with any disease, and especially of an extraordinary kind, it is common to inquire what was the cause of it. What produced it. And sometimes we can trace it to its cause, a violent cold or something else. If not, we say we cannot tell. But in ancient times, unaccountable disorders were traced to demons as the cause of them.

Mark 2: 22—28. In verse 21, we are told Jesus' friends went out to lay hold on him; for they said, He is beside himself. Remember, that we have seen the Jews said of Jesus, "He hath a demon and is mad." Jesus' friends only mentioned the visible or supposed visible effect, derangement of mind. But the Jews mention both the supposed cause and the effect. He is "mad," but they also say, "he hath a demon" which is the cause of it. Now notice what is said verse 22. "And the scribes which came down from Jerusalem said, He hath Beelzebub," naming the very demon they supposed him possessed with and had made him mad. They imputed his madness to no ordinary demon, but to the prince of the demons, and supposed that by this prince of the demons he cast out demons. But Beelzebub, as we have seen, was the god of Ekron, a heathen deity, which could neither curse nor bless, but was a nonentity. It deserves special notice that what the Jews said on this occasion, and repeated on several others, shows what were the popular opinions respecting demons in the days of our Lord. Whether true or false, they seem to have been common, pervading all ranks of society, as the opinions about witches did, among us, only a few years ago.

Matt. 15: 21—29; Mark 7: 24—31. The case recorded in these two passages is that of the daughter of

a woman who was a Greek. She said, "My daughter is grievously vexed with a demon." Mark calls it "an unclean spirit," and also a demon; which shows both these phrases expressed the same thing. The mother's request was that Jesus "would cast forth the demon, the unclean spirit, out of her daughter." But how did she know or suppose that it was in her? For no disease of body or insanity of mind is mentioned about her in either of the passages. Yet we are told "she was made whole from that very hour," and when her mother came to her house, "she found the demon gone out," and her daughter laid upon the bed. Now, what demon did she find had gone out of her daughter? Certainly the demon which before had "grievously vexed" her. And what demon could this be but the disease of which Jesus had cured her? What her disease was, we may at least conjecture from other passages where it is said "a demon vexed or grievously tormented" other persons. See Matt 8: 6. We have seen that all great disorders of either body or mind were ascribed to the influence of demons. But, as the disorder of this woman's daughter is not described, it is vain for us to say what it precisely was. Perhaps it was not exactly known to themselves, and its symptoms were so different from those of other diseases, that no description is given of it. But from the popular opinions of the day about demons, and her daughter's disease, the mother concluded she was grievously vexed with a demon. And when she came home to her house, and found her disease removed, she concluded that the demon had left her. We should think this a plain case; that the only demon in her was her disease, and nothing but the common popular superstition had imputed its cause to a demon. And this was done in a similar way as when we impute a fever to a cold. And do we not often ascribe disorders to supposed causes, just as the heathen supposed demons to be the cause of madness and other disorders? When we hear of a friend or neighbor who has become deranged, we ask what was the cause of it. Sometimes it is im-

puted to disease, to loss of property, failure in business, and disappointments, etc. And if it cannot be traced to some cause, we never, as in ancient times, impute it to a demon. But why not? Because this is not a popular opinion among us, and we know that insanity arises from bodily disease, and can be cured by natural means.

Matt. 8 : 28—34 : Mark 5 : 1—21; Luke 8 : 26—40. These three passages contain three accounts of the Gadarene demoniac. They are deemed the strongest in proof that demons are fallen angels, or evil spirits. Matthew says there were two men, but Mark and Luke only mention one. As my design and limits forbid me to discuss this and other things, I shall confine myself to the question, was the person commonly called the Gadarene demoniac actually possessed with demons? To answer this correctly, we ought to consider what was his real condition, and what his supposed condition. 1. What was his real condition when our Lord met with him at Gadara? Obviously a deranged man, a madman, a raging, furious maniac. All the three accounts agree in this, and we only need to read them to be satisfied of the fact. We are told, that after Jesus had cured him, he was found, "sitting, clothed, and in his right mind," which shows that he was not in his right mind before; his dwelling-place, his words and his actions, all confirm this. Our insane asylums furnish abundant instances of as strange sayings and doings.

2. What was the supposed condition of this man? That he was a madman was notorious to all. What was the supposed cause of his madness? Not disease, but demons which possessed him. And they are denominated in the accounts "unclean spirits," etc. This was the popular belief, as we have seen. The Jews supposed our Lord to be possessed with the prince of demons. But a fact and a supposition are very different things. No evidence of the fact have we yet seen. The man himself supposed that he was possessed with demons, yea, had a legion of them in him. But what else could this be but

supposition, and a very wild supposition of a maniac, founded on the superstitious opinions which prevailed about demons. The real condition of the man accounts rationally for such an extravagant supposition. No man in his sober senses can believe he had a legion of demons or evil spirits in him. Mary Magdalene had seven demons in her; but as this man was more deranged than she was, it was supposed he had a legion in him. The number of demons was probably increased according to the degree of the person's insanity, or the unaccountable nature of the person's disease.

If it is objected, mad as this man was, did he not cry out, "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee, by God, that thou torment me not,"—I answer, we all know madmen sometimes speak very rationally and speak the truth too. Matthew says, torment "before the time." But it is not said to be in a future state; and if it was, what then? It was the common belief, then as now, that the Devil and his angels were to torment men forever. All this was in perfect keeping with the opinions of the day, certainly nothing strange in a madman, for many are mad enough now to hold the same opinions. Confessing Jesus to be the Son of God is no difficulty, unless it could be shown the man had never heard anything about Jesus, but was taught to make this confession by the legion of demons he supposed to be in him. But who can prove this? Jesus' fame accounts for the man's confession. I may add as a reason why the man asked Jesus not to torment him, it is immediately added both by Mark and Luke, "for he said unto him, come out of the man, thou unclean spirit." The madman seems to have thought the removal of the demons would prove a torment, and he wished to continue in his present condition.

Besides, when Jesus asked his name, he answered, "My name is Legion, for we are many." Was this anything but the man's wild supposition? He besought Jesus, in behalf of the demons, "that he would not send them

away out of the country." And was not this mere imagination? We are then told, "There was nigh unto the mountains a great herd of swine feeding," said to be about two thousand. And it is said "All the demons besought him, saying, Send us into the swine, that we may enter into them." But did a legion of demons in the man all make this request, or did they use the man's organs of speech to make it for them? Be this as it may, Jesus gave them leave, and out they went into the swine, "and the herd ran violently down a steep place and were choked in the sea." The request of the demons was, that they might not be sent out of the country nor go into the deep, but into the swine; and as soon as they got into them they rushed with the swine out into the deep. But, strange as all this appears, it is related as a fact that the swine did rush into the sea and perish, as the after part of the accounts shows. The important and only question we need to consider is what went out of the man and entered into the swine? One or other of the following views must be taken, for the case does not admit of a third.

1. That the demons went out of the man and entered into the swine. But, if we take this view of the matter, it follows that a whole legion of demons were in the man, went out of him, and entered into two thousand swine. How many this was to each of them the reader can calculate. And to take this view of the subject is at variance with all said in the Bible about demons, except in this account and the few passages which speak of persons possessed with them. The Old and New Testament writers speak of demons as heathen gods, nothings. But the account we are considering is in unison with the popular superstition which prevailed in the time of our Lord, as has been shown in the course of our remarks. To believe a legion of demons were in this madman, and, leaving him, entered into two thousand swine, is not very agreeable to reason, common sense, or observation. If a man now, in one of our insane hospitals, spoke and acted

as this madman did, and the superintendent imputed all this to his being possessed with demons, he would be immediately dismissed as unfit for his situation.

2. The only other answer which can be given to the question is, that the man's madness left him, and went into the swine. Nothing else could leave the one and go into the other, for this was all that could go out, which could affect the swine. His wild insanity led him to suppose a legion of demons were in him, and to request that they might be permitted to enter the swine. And when the man's madness left him and entered the swine, they became mad and rushed on to their own destruction. Nor is it strange that the man's insanity should be transferred to them, any more than that Naaman's leprosy should be transferred to Gehazi, 2 Kings, chap. 5. To say, the man's madness entered into the swine, is rational, and accounts for their rushing into the sea. If insanity in the man drove him to act as he did, it need not surprise us that, when it entered the swine, it drove them into the sea. I think no other rational view can be taken of the subject; and all objections which may be urged against it arise from overlooking the fact that the New Testament writers speak, in the above passages, according to the usual language of the day about demons. And, be it observed, it is only when they speak of the supposed influence of demons in men that they speak as in the preceding passages. In connection with doctrines they speak of them as idols, as mere nonentities.

I am aware it may be said, Why did not our Lord speak of demons according to the truth about them, and not in the popular language of the day, which is so apt to mislead us? No one, I answer, need to be misled, if he attends to the plain instructions of the Bible about demons, evil spirits, etc., as I have attempted to show. Had the writers of the New Testament not spoken of common events in the common language of their day, how could they have been understood? And to have corrected all the false notions of people and their false

language, would have been an endless and vain task. If speaking of demons as they sometimes did, be found fault with, why not extend it to other things? Why did our Lord speak of transmigration as true, and allow his disciples to do it, without correcting them? See John 9: 1—3; Matt. 16: 13, 14. But why not blame ourselves? for every day we speak in the common language of our day, and not according to the truth of things. Most people would smile at our affectation if we did not.

James 2: 19. "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; the demons also believe and tremble." James wrote to believing Jews, chap. 1: 1; and it is obvious, from the context, that he was reasoning against some of them who said they had faith, but had not works to prove it. Here he reasons with them on their own admitted principles concerning the demons. They believed demons were the souls of wicked men, and were in torment after death. To expose their false profession, and convince them that it was vain, James says, "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well." This he commends. But he adds, "the demons also believe," and so far they are equal to you. But the demons not only believe, but also "tremble," and their faith shows itself by their works, and in this they excel you. Your faith does not produce works, but theirs does, and they condemn you on your own principles. The demon's faith is not dead, but yours is dead, "for know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead." It seems to me obvious that James is not here teaching or approving what they believed about demons, but refuting their pretensions to faith, from their own opinions concerning demons. He does not admit their opinions true, but reasons with them on their believing them to be true. He said they did well in believing "that there is one God." But he does not say they did well in believing that "the demons also believe and tremble." But why not commend them for this if it was true?

This view of the passage appears to me agreeable to

the context, for in the remainder of the chapter James goes on to refute their false profession, by showing that Abraham's faith proved itself by works. He also shows that Rahab's faith was proved by works, and concludes thus, "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." But let it be supposed that James here teaches that demons are evil spirits, or the souls of dead men, what then? It follows that they believe, and that they also tremble in a future state. But it also follows that this is the only text in the Bible where these opinions are taught. Where else do we read of any kind of demons either believing or trembling in such a state? This is not even said of the demons which were supposed to possess men and torment them; and if any demons had cause to tremble, certainly they had. But I do not find that they were even threatened with any punishment, either in this world or a future state. Is not this a strange admission, if demons were the souls of wicked men? And that this has been the belief of heathen, Jews, and many Christians, we have seen in the preceding investigation. But, I ask, did Jews or Christians derive such views from divine revelation respecting the torment of demons or the souls of the wicked after death? If from the Bible, in what place shall I find it? If they did not derive them from the heathen, all must admit it was not for the want of opportunity, for such opinions prevailed among them.

If James, in this passage, teaches the common notions about demons, that they are evil spirits, or the souls of wicked men, who can reconcile his teaching with the other sacred writers in the many passages which have come under our consideration? We have seen that they denounce all demons, and declare them to be nothings in the world; and not until the Babylonian captivity did the Jews learn that demons were anything else. Before this, they worshipped demons, and for which God reproved and punished them. But not a hint is given that demons were real beings of any kind, or could do

good or evil to any one. By whose authority, then, were demons transformed into real beings, evil beings, and that a whole legion of them could enter into one man? And must we believe, on one solitary verse in the epistle of James, that demons believed and trembled? Before I can do this, I must see how my views of this verse can be proved erroneous.

In the preceding examination we have seen that demons and unclean spirits express the same thing. A few texts remain, where the last phrase occurs, in which demons are not mentioned. Mark 1: 27; 3: 27, and Luke 7: 21, we may pass without any remarks. The others I shall very briefly notice. In Acts 5: 16, it is said that among other sick folks, brought to be cured by the apostles, were some "vexed with unclean spirits; and they were healed every one." If unclean spirits mean demons here, as in other texts, nothing is said about casting them out, but that the persons "were healed." And is not this a confirmation that casting out demons and healing persons supposed to be possessed with demons, only meant the same thing? When the person was healed, it was concluded that the demon had gone out of him. Why? Because the disease was ascribed to the demon as the cause of it, and both went out together.

In Acts 8: 5—8, we are told Philip went to Samaria, preached there, and wrought miracles. "Unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of many that were possessed with them; and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed." The unclean spirits here mean demons, as in other texts. And when it is said they cried out, we ought to understand the persons cried out, and not the demons or unclean spirits.

Acts 16: 16—19. It is said, "a certain damsel was possessed with a spirit of divination," or, of Python as in the margin; that is of Apollo. There were many in the heathen world who practised divination, and some were supposed to have in them demons which prophesied. They were called Pythons, from Apollo Pythias, one of

the principal prophesying demons, whose priestess at Delphi was from him called Pythia. This damsel was supposed to be inspired with the spirit of this dead man. The account of her is told in the language of the times, and as the heathen would have spoken about her. Some have thought that Apollo Pythias refers to Python, a famous ventriloquist, and that this damsel deceived people by her practice of this art. Others derive the name from "*peten*, serpents, which was an animal particularly respected by the heathen, in their divinations, as being to them an emblem or representative of the solar light, or, Apollo, their divining God." The damsel referred to in this passage, like all the heathen prophetesses, seemed, under their inspiration, to be mad, and this is countenanced by her following Paul for many days, etc. She was probably a fortune-teller, and imposed on people by the art of ventriloquism, for by this art the woman at Endor imposed on Saul. Such persons were said to have a familiar spirit and consulted with the dead, and one of them divined to Saul the issue of an impending battle. But all such impostors were condemned and banished from the land of Israel.

Acts 19: 13—17. Please also read this passage, and observe, that the facts related took place at Ephesus, a place famous for using curious arts, and having books relating to them. See verses 18, 19. Verse 12 says, "evil spirits" went out of some, by parts of Paul's clothing being brought to them. Among the users of the curious arts at Ephesus, were "certain vagabond Jews, exorcists," and Sceva, a Jew, had seven sons who appear to have been of the number. They attempted to expel demons and cure diseases by charms, scents, the sounds of certain Hebrew words, etc. "If you exorcise," says Justin against Trypho, "in the name of any of your kings, or just men, or prophets, or patriarchs, none of the demons will obey you; but, if indeed, any of you exorcise by the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, probably he will obey you." The sons

of Sceva, finding Paul more successful in casting out evil spirits by the name of Jesus, attempted doing it in the same way, and on a man who was deranged. But the evil spirit, or the madness in the man, we should think led him to say, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?" But how did he know all this? Probably by Paul's success in casting out evil spirits in Jesus name, or restoring madmen to a sound mind, while the attempts of the sons of Sceva failed. That this man was insane and furious, is evident from his treatment of these impostors; see verse 16. The account ends without informing us whether Paul healed this maniac, but we are told, "Many that believed came and confessed, and showed their deeds. Many of them also which used curious arts, brought their books together and burned them before all men: and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver. So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed."

We have now finished our examination of the Bible on the subject of demons, evil spirits, etc., etc. We are not aware that a single text has been overlooked in our investigation. Our object has been to ascertain what the Scriptures teach; and how we have succeeded must be left to the decision of the reader. Our investigation has been brief, for our limits did not permit us to enlarge. But enough has been said to lead the reader to reflection, and further examination of the subject. Much has been left out which we wished to insert, and may be used should our attention be again called to the subject.

In confirmation of the views we have advanced, a number of facts might be added. But I shall only name a few of them. Several of them have been hinted at already in our remarks. 1. The doctrine of demons was not introduced among the Jews by divine revelation, but by the heathen that surrounded them. It came first among them by their sacrificing to their gods, as we have seen from passages in the Old Testament. Noth-

ing can be more certain than that it had a heathen origin, and when introduced was condemned by God in their Scriptures. No Old Testament writer gives the least countenance to the doctrine of demons, or the worship of them; nor is a single hint given that they were real beings, or had ever been so. And as to persons being possessed with demons, not a vestige of evidence respecting this is to be found in all the Old Testament. It begins and ends without any allusion to such a thing. The case of Saul is no exception to this. The Old Testament prophets performed miraculous cures on persons, but not one of them is ever said to have "cast out demons." Nor in Moses' laws were any rites of purification prescribed for such as had demons cast out of them, although this was done for persons cured of the leprosy and other disorders. Besides, the Old Testament prophets predicted the miraculous cures which the Messiah should perform when he appeared. See Isaiah, chapter thirty-five, and other passages. But not one of them intimates that he was to cast out demons, evil spirits, or the ghosts of dead men. But how could they overlook this, if the possessions in the New Testament were real possessions of such beings, for their casting them out is represented as the most wonderful work of Christ?

2. It is also a fact that the doctrine of demons, and men being possessed with them, was not a new revelation given to the world by the New Testament writers. We read of demons in the Old Testament, but of no one being possessed with them. But, when many read the New Testament concerning possessions of demons, they conclude that this must be a new revelation from God to mankind. This is a great mistake, for in Egypt, Chaldea, Greece, and other heathen countries, demons were well known, and the idea was held that persons were possessed with them. In India this was also well known in the days of Christ. And all must here notice that the New Testament never speaks of demons, or of persons being possessed with them, as a new or strange thing.

They are introduced and spoken of like other common things of the day. It is not demons in men that are spoken of with surprise, but the Saviour's casting them out. This is mentioned as a most extraordinary event, for it was never done before as he performed it. Before his day, demons were common, were cast out, or pretended to be cast out of persons, as could easily be shown by abundant testimony. And this was even done in Judea in the days of Solomon, and down to the days of Josephus, if he may be credited. And that other persons cast out demons, or cured persons supposed to be possessed with them, there is abundant testimony in proof of it, were it disputed.

3. It is also a fact that demons were considered the ghosts or the souls of dead wicked men. The quotations from Parkhurst, Enfield and others, abundantly prove this. But, do either Old or New Testament writers sanction this as true? Nothing like this is to be found in their writings; nor do they describe them as real beings of any kind whatever. But admit them to be the souls of dead wicked men, and what follows? It follows that the souls of wicked men in ancient times were not sent to hell, as many have believed, but took up their abodes in the bodies of men to torment them. Souls surely could not be in two such different places at once. And to say they carried their hell about with them wherever they went, is to say that hell changes with the times, and any new use which men may have for it. But no such notions are to be found in the Bible.

4. Another fact is certain, that we never read in the Scriptures of the souls of dead good men, taking possession of any persons, whether pious or profane. But why not? Is it not as rational to conclude that good men's souls would do this as the souls of wicked men? And might we not expect that God would so far permit good men's souls to take up their abode in the same bodies with the souls of wicked men, as to counteract their evil influence upon them? It is not much to the honor of

God's character to permit the one without also permitting the other. And if this is admitted as true, then souls both good and bad neither go to hell nor heaven after death, but stay in our world to do good and evil to mankind. But will people, in our day, give up their views of hell or heaven? One of the two must be done, for to believe the popular opinions about demons, and also about hell and heaven, seems to be impossible, unless we are determined to credit the most palpable contradictions.

5. But it is also a fact that the scripture writers do not speak as men have done, and some do now, about the souls of either good or bad men after death. The heathen sent the souls of wicked men to *Tartarus* after death, and the souls of good men to *Elysium*. But where did they learn such notions? Not from the Bible, but from their own vain imaginations. The Jews and others sent all good and bad to *sheol* or *hades*. But some divided this place into two parts, the one for the good and the other for the wicked. But does the Bible do this? No; is it not rather an alteration, or improvement on the heathen opinions respecting their Tartarus and Elysium? And, pray, what great improvement have modern Christians made on the ancient heathen, for their hell is pretty much the same as theirs? Some make a heaven for good souls before the resurrection of the dead, compounded of heathen opinions and scripture statements of immortality to man promised after it. But, if we are to leave behind us the Bible in one thing, and embrace heathen opinions, at what point are we to stop? Why not believe in their doctrine of demons in all its breadth and length? And why not advocate that persons in our day are possessed with demons, as in ancient times? Why should we not say that a wild maniac has a legion of demons in him?

We intended to state more facts in confirmation of the views advanced, and also notice some objections which might be made against them. But we must close for the present. In conclusion, we remark, that we have with some care examined the Scriptures, to know what is

meant by the term satan, devil, and demons. We have stated the result of our examination, and rise from it with the fullest convictions that the common opinions entertained on these subjects have no foundation in the Bible. Let a false idea be attached to words in one country and age, and, however superstitious it may be, it will descend to posterity; let it once take root in men's minds, and who can calculate to what extent it will grow, and to how many generations it will descend as an inheritance to their children?

God has given to men a revelation of his will, to guide them both as to faith and practice. Their wisdom and happiness consist in holding fast the faithful word and obeying it without alteration or addition. Who ever altered or added to it, and thereby promoted the glory of God, his own good, and the happiness of mankind?

APPENDIX TO PART THIRD.

The question is often asked, why the Saviour adopted the common language of his times respecting demons, if he did not endorse the prevailing opinions in regard to them? The inquiry is a natural one, and deserves a careful consideration. We shall be assisted in answering it, by noticing some of the difficulties in which we are involved, if we say he adopted the current views. There is hardly any idea which we conceive more absurd than that men were possessed of evil spirits. Reason rejects it with disdain, and pronounces it a vulgar superstition. It is not natural, and does not accord with what we know of ourselves, or with what the best physicians teach with reference to disease. Why are not we afflicted as the demoniacs supposed themselves to be? Why do we not hear spirits talk, as they are said to have talked in Christ's time? What reason can be assigned for our entire freedom from the influence of spirits? But this is not all. If we say that Christ endorsed the common theory, he endorsed all the vagaries of the possessed; for he speaks with reference to them the same as with reference to the theory itself. Thus we make him endorse the conceit of the Gadarene demoniac, that he had a legion, that is, five thousand, evil spirits in him; we make him endorse the notion that the spirits in this madman spoke to Christ, and requested permission to enter the herd of swine! Others may ascribe such folly, if they choose, to the Son of God, but we can have no part in thus degrading him.

Passing these difficulties, I will observe that there is nothing peculiar in the course pursued by the Saviour, in his manner of speaking upon this subject; he did only what is common among

all persons. Paul did the same. In Acts 16 : 16, 17, we have an account of a heathen woman, who was supposed to possess a spirit of divination or of Python. Python was one of the names of Apollo, the Grecian god of the fine arts, music, poetry, medicine and eloquence. It was supposed that he was their inventor. "Diviners and soothsayers were called by his name, as the priestesses in the temple of Apollo were believed to be inspired by the god, and to utter oracles when in the state of enthusiasm and ecstasy. This popular term was adopted by the sacred writer, without, of course, endorsing the truth or error of that belief of the Gentile world. The language of the times was used, the modes of speech, the idioms, the phrases, because that was the only language which could be understood by the generality."—*Livermore*. Being annoyed by having this damsel follow him, and cry that he was the servant of the Most High, which showed the way of salvation, Paul "turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her; and he came out the same hour." But surely we are not to infer from this that he recognized the truth of this heathen notion. If, however, he did not, why did he adopt such language? why address the spirit supposed to be in her? why bid it come out of her? Obviously for the reason that the people believed her to have the spirit of Python, and to foretell by its assistance future events. He adapted himself to their superstition and used their language, for he wished only to effect a cure, to establish the divine claims of religion, and to show that there was no power like that of God. In this there was no deception, for to cure an insane person was as much a miracle as to cast out the spirit of Apollo. But whatever may have been his reason for the language employed, we cannot suppose, either that Apollo had a real existence, or that this maiden had power to reveal the future. She was a soothsayer, and probably in a measure insane.

"Similar language is used in reference to other diseases. (See Luke 4 : 38, 39.) 'And Simon's wife's mother was taken with a *great fever*; and they besought him for her. And he stood over her, and *rebuked the fever*, and immediately she arose and ministered unto them.' Here Jesus cast out the *fever*, as in the other

case he cast out the *insanity;* and we do not see why any one cannot make out the *fever* to be a real *demon* as well as the insanity. By comparing verses 40, 41 of the same chapter, it will be further seen that the demons were diseases which Jesus healed at his word. 'All they that had sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them, and healed them.' And then, to show how some were healed of their *diseases*, it is added, 'And demons came out of many, crying,' &c. Does not this show that the casting out the demons was healing the disease?"

"That Christ should adopt the common language of the day on this subject, as well as on others, is certainly no matter of surprise. Nor does it follow that by so doing he confirmed the people in the doctrine of real possessions. It is common, always and everywhere, to employ, on given subjects, the popular language of the day, and that without being held accountable for the errors from which it took its rise. We use the word lunacy, but we do not believe that the moon has anything to do with insanity; and we speak also of St. Anthony's fire, and St. Vitus' dance, without believing in the power and existence of these saints, much less that they are the authors of the disorders bearing their names. And so we say of a man that 'he is out of his head,' 'has lost his senses,' &c.; which expressions are far from being philosophical, yet are universally used. We speak, likewise, of 'catching cold,' as if it were something to be laid hold of, or seized with the hands; of a fever *leaving* a patient, as though it had a personality; of a disorder *attacking* him, as if it came upon him like an armed man; which phrases, according to the strict construction of language, are grossly incorrect, and yet are everywhere current. Now it would be just as unreasonable to conclude, that because a physician calls a certain disease St. Anthony's fire, he therefore believes it to be caused by that saint, or because he says a fever leaves a patient, it has an individuality, and goes about from place to place,—as to conclude that because Christ adopted the popular language of his age respecting demoniacal possession, he really believed it, or because he represents the

demon as departing, or going out of the insane, he supposed it to be anything more than the disorder.

"In like manner, the sacred writers employ on other subjects the language of the multitude, though based upon opinions known to be false. The Psalmist says, 'He hath founded it (the earth) upon the seas, and established it upon the floods' (Ps. 24 : 2). So Joshua says to the sun, 'Stand thou still,' which expression belongs to a popular notion known to be erroneous. And David represents the sun as '*running a race*' (Ps. 19 : 5, 6); and as '*knowing* his going down' (104 : 19). The Saviour also speaks of God 'making his sun to rise' (Matt. 5 : 4). All these are examples of the use of language by the sacred writers and teachers, not according to the philosophy of the subject, but according to the received opinions in relation to it; and the remark made by Calvin in relation to the Psalmist's declaration that God had founded the earth upon the seas, may be repeated of all these inspired teachers, that they 'do not treat the subject philosophically, but speak in a popular manner, adapting their language to the apprehension of the vulgar' (sed populariter loquens ad rudium captum se accomodat). And the inquiry may be made with equal propriety, — why did not the Psalmist, why did not the Saviour, correct these errors of the people, instead of employing such language as would confirm them in their false opinions? Yet they did not." — *Universalist Expositor*, vol. III., new series. Article by Rev. T. B. Thayer.

Perhaps it will be said, this reasoning, though plausible, is not satisfactory; for we cannot think that Christ would have adopted the phraseology of his times on this subject, if he had not received the opinion in which it originated. Suppose we grant this, do we thereby avoid difficulty? If we admit the existence of demons, we must admit also the common opinion that they produced insanity, fits, and various other diseases. Dr. Barnes unhesitatingly adopts this absurdity, in opposition to all medical science. While that science explains the causes of diseases, and accounts for them on natural principles, and treats them in accordance with their origin, he places himself in direct opposition to it, and attributes insanity and other diseases to demons. Hear him: "We still see a multitude of cases that no man can prove *not* to

be produced by the presence of an evil spirit. Who would attempt to say that some evil being may not have much to do in the case of madmen?"— *Com. on Matt.* 4: 24. Rev. H. J. Ripley, in his Notes on the Gospels, endorses this idea. Now we are frank to confess that we cannot thus array the Bible against medical science; and we find it much easier to suppose that Christ adopted the common language of his age in regard to demons, without intending to endorse it, than to suppose that medical science is entirely wrong in the idea that disease has a natural cause. Medical men of this age are not alone in their theory in regard to diseases. Many of the learned in the age of Christ had the same theory. Aristotle said that those supposed to have demons were merely under the influence of melancholy. Hippocrates wrote a work to prove that epilepsy was the effect of natural causes. Plotinus says only the vulgar held that diseases were caused by demons. Origen says this was the opinion of physicians in his times. Pasidonius, the most eminent physician of his times, affirms that insanity was owing, not to demons, but to a redundancy of peccant humors. The opinions of such men are worthy of consideration, for they judged from a knowledge of men and disease, and were not swayed by vulgar superstitions.

But grant that we are wrong on this point, and that diseases were produced by demons, does it follow, as is commonly supposed, that those demons were fallen angels? The argument is, because Christ spoke of them in the common language of his times, he meant to endorse the common opinion on this subject. The question, therefore, arises, what was the common opinion? An answer to this question will be fatal to the popular theory respecting fallen angels.

Dr. Barnes, though usually very accurate in his historical statements, in his argument to prove that persons were actually possessed of evil spirits assumes that they were once angels in heaven. After having presented several considerations to show that real spirits possessed men, and were cast out of them, that what was said concerning the spirits could not have been said of diseases or merely diseased persons, he adds, "Nor is there any absurdity in the opinion that those persons were really under the influence of devils. First. It is no more absurd to suppose that

an angel, or many angels, should have fallen and become wicked, than that so many men should. Second. It is no more absurd that Satan should have possession of the human faculties. or inflict diseases, than that men should do it; a thing which is done every day," &c. — See *Com. on Matt.* 4: 24. Here we see his assumption. First he attempts to prove that men actually had in them evil spirits, and then takes it for granted that those spirits were once angels in heaven.

Now if demons were fallen angels the fact was unknown to the Jewish people. Their idea of them was entirely different. We have the best authority for saying that the common opinion among them was, that demons were the spirits of the dead. Josephus, in his writings, makes frequent reference to them; and in his Jewish War, book VII., chap. vi., sect. 3, speaking of a very remarkable root he says, "Yet after all this pains in getting, it is only valuable on account of one virtue it hath, that if it be only brought to the sick persons, it quickly drives away those called *demons*, which are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men that are alive and kill them, unless they can obtain some help against them." Here was the Jewish opinion. Demons were the spirits of the wicked, and not fallen angels. Admit, then, that in the time of Christ such spirits did actually possess men, and it affords not a particle of proof that angels fell from heaven. Dr. Barnes, therefore, gains nothing to sustain his theory respecting fallen angels, and is reduced to the necessity of admitting that demons were only the spirits of dead men.

In conclusion, let me say, in thus adapting himself to the language of his times, Jesus shows that it was better to allow a mere superstition, which affected none of the vital questions concerning God, or the plan of salvation, or the principles of duty, to be removed by time and the general influence of his religion, than for him to turn aside from his great work to refute it. He came to establish his divine system of truth, and to this work he consecrated his whole time, leaving minor errors, and especially those pertaining to science, to be corrected by others. On theology and on religious and moral duty, instead of passing over errors, he was entirely different, and sought to displace error by truth.

O. A. S.

INDEX OF TEXTS ILLUSTRATED.